

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

32101 063843658

Digitized by Google

5732
.497

5732
.497
Elizabeth Foundation,



LIBRARY
OF THE
College of New Jersey.
22.1372.4

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

15/12 = 3.

Digitized by Google

PROFOUND PROBLEMS IN THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PROFOUND PROBLEMS

IN

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

BY

THE REV. GEORGE JAMIESON, B.D.,

MINISTER OF THE FIRST CHARGE, OLD MACHAR.

LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.,

STATIONER'S HALL COURT.

1884.

Digitized by Google

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Digitized by Google

TO MY REVEREND BRETHREN

IN THE MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL,

WHO STAND BY ITS EXCLUSIVE TEACHING,

AS THE ONLY RULE WHEREBY MAN CAN GLORIFY GOD,

THIS VOLUME,

THE FRUIT OF A PATIENT AND PRAYERFUL STUDY

OF SOME OF THE MOST PROFOUND AND IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES,

AND PUBLISHED IN THE HOPE OF A MORE

IMPLICIT FAITH AND EXPLICIT UNITY

IN DIVINE DOCTRINE,

IS HUMBLY SUBMITTED TO THEIR CANDID CONSIDERATION,

AND RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

(RECAP)

28154

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE contents of this volume are the result of more than thirty years' reflection. I venture to present them to the public with very considerable diffidence—not from any doubt as to their general accuracy, but for reasons *ab extra* which come home to myself. Their deviation from the accustomed lines of analysis—the disrelish of many for paths which are by them believed to lie beyond the human range—the suspicion attached to what some are mistakingly disposed to call new-born ideas—the difficulty which most people have in unlearning acquired sentiments, or in yielding up received credences, and the tendency in these circumstances to misapprehend and to misinterpret one's meaning, if not also summarily to put down pretensions which lay claim to fresh discoveries—a tendency not likely to be lessened by the fact of many inherent defects, of which I am very conscious;—these and other reasons might well make an author thus placed, apprehensive as to how his book will be received.

One prevailing sentiment, however, has in the face of all these reasons, ultimately overruled my strong reluctance to publish the book, *viz.*, the deeply settled

Digitized by Google

conviction that the *fundamental connections and characteristics* of Christian doctrine, as contained in our Creeds, and derived from the Sacred Scriptures, can be more profoundly expounded and satisfactorily established, than has yet been done. There is the fact, indeed, that the wall of partition, which has heretofore shut off religion from science, has recently to some extent been broken down, by the publication, among others, of such works as Mr. Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and the Duke of Argyll's "Unity of Nature"; and this, not only without any detriment to the teaching of the Bible, but rather to the strengthening and confirming of Bible-truth. Hence the anticipation, which may fairly be cherished, that a farther interpenetration into the deep problems which still remain for solution, if fairly conducted on scientific principles, and with due reverence for the revealed verities of Holy Scripture, ought to prove an enormous help for their general propagation. Taking this into account, there arises the ardent desire, which every right-minded man must share, if he can but see his way in this direction, to promote in some measure, however small, the ultimate and intimate union of the Churches on a basis that will bear the most searching examination.

That basis must be one of Law. "Of law (says Hooker) there can be no less acknowledged than this, that her seat is the bosom of God, and her voice is the harmony of the world." Hence the demand must be to find the Key which shall unlock the great secret —the Clue which shall trace out the method of uni-

Digitized by Google

versal function in the operations of nature, both physical and mental. It is a sound philosophy alone which can fulfil this end. No doubt there are difficulties in Philosophy as well as in Theology to be surmounted, before the principles of Law can be thoroughly explored, evolved and made patent and plain to the understanding; and consequently, before the Churches can come to be at one; and consequently farther, before the intellectual world generally shall be brought to yield to, and embrace, the cause of Christ. But if it be true (as Sir William Hamilton says) that "no difficulty emerges in Theology, that does not first present itself in Philosophy," it naturally follows that the removal of difficulties from the sphere of Philosophy will go far to obviate the embarrassments that meet us in the realm of Theology.

In Philosophy there is the profound question of *Substance*—that which is properly regarded as the primary foundation of what we experience as the two sub-departments of *matter* and of *mind*. All that can be hoped for here, is to formulate such definitions as shall present a natural concatenation of these departments with the primal foundation: such, moreover, as will go to expound the relationship of objects, as differentiated from one another; and further, such as will elucidate the operations of what is called *Cause*, in producing the phenomenon which is called *Effect;* and in this way to expound the eventualities of nature in all their complex and minute variety. This, in fact, is the problem given forth by Hume, and left unsolved by Kant—a problem which constitutes the Philosophy of law.

Digitized by Google

It is not very much that can be advanced to meet the requirements of this problem, in a work like this, which is chiefly devoted to theological exposition. A theory has been broached in the Excursus (see particularly Excursus XIII. and XVII.) under which the Forces of the world, physical, vital and mental, shew their respective functions, and present their varied phenomena in subordinate sequence, while each department preserves its own category to which it relatively belongs. This much only may be stated here, that whatever sort of Forces are manifested in our experience, all is referable to *two primordial constants*, inalienable from the very idea of substance; in as far as they are present in *every particular* of substance, and therefore of necessity traceable to what we must regard as their *generic attitude* in original or primary substance, *viz.*, *Quality* and *Energy*. In particulars the former is broken up into conditions and sub-conditions; and the latter, which is inseparable from the former, is of course, in these circumstances, developed as force—force invariably measured by condition. In this investigation I have elaborated my own pathway by the help of the stepping-stones provided by scientists—a pathway wherein the presence of spirit is manifested in material operations, and wherein the dilemma of materialism is clearly avoided in purely mental states—a pathway which enters the dark region of Psychology through the more open territory of Physiology—a pathway wherein an *a posteriori* course, *i.e.*, a strictly inductive course is persistently pursued, as resting upon acknowledged facts, the exposition of which has been tested by acknowledged principles; and the

Digitized by Google

result, as it seems to me, brings it out that the scheme of law in the physical world is the necessary preparation, as giving birth to the scheme of law in the region of the intellectual, thereby opening up a fresh vista for apprehending what may be called the law of Divine operations in the conscious world of religious life. Others will scan these pretensions with a critical eye, and see difficulties where I have failed; and while I may not deprecate sound and healthy criticism which should serve to bring the truth into bolder relief, I hope to be forgiven, if after a long day of honest investigation, I frankly appeal to the intelligent, patient, and candid reader, whether, with all the imperfections inevitable from a work of this sort, there is not on the whole an approximation to satisfy the requirements of science; and if so, whether such questions as Force and the source of force—Mind and the fountain of mind—Will and the mainspring of will—Freedom of Will and the ground of freedom—Morals and the foundation of morals—Evil and the origin of evil—have been rationally treated, and effectively worked out.

In Theology there are the great central themes of *Sin* and of *Atonement*—themes next in importance to the question of the Divine Personality. These themes and the collateral questions which encircle them, have received the attention which they deserve. It is believed that these deep subjects have been discussed in a sober and scientific spirit, while the facts, for which explanation is sought, have exclusively been derived from the inspired Word of God. Until the difficult problem of Sin in its primary seat, shall have been fairly and

Digitized by Google

finally solved, it must be utterly impossible for the Church to assign to the Lord Jesus Christ the precise relation in which He stood to sin; and therefore impossible to ascertain the precise grounds on which He took away sin: that is, until we know the precise Scriptural features of the Incarnation, which it was incumbent on Him to assume, in order to become the Saviour, it must be impossible precisely to estimate the exact process, under which alone the Redemption and Restoration of the manhood were in Him effected, and under which alone, these terms can be fairly understood, accurately interpreted and satisfactorily determined. The condition of the first Adam must be psychologically apprehended, as explaining the change, and the process of the change, which overtook him in his created state, and the consequent heritage which he left to his posterity, in order to our being in a position to understand and to interpret the condition of the second Adam as sent to lay hold of what is ours, and as established to meet and intercept, to reverse and remove, the state of fallen manhood; and therefore in order to our being able to apprehend the restoration, and the process of the restoration, which the Lord Jesus Christ introduced—introduced, not only as wrought out in His own person, but as applicable to ordinary man, in order to man's acquiring the integrity which is alone acceptable to God, and which alone is adapted for that appointed sphere of blessedness in the coming dispensation of spirit-life.

The problem of the Divine Decrees has also been sifted upon anthropological principles—the only principles which can consist with reason and with Scripture-

Digitized by Google

teaching; for in this case alone, can man, as made in the image of God, be regarded as properly entitled to scan the Divine intelligence or to offer any argument at all, respecting the mind and determinations of God. The problem also of man's Freedom under God's decrees and the Divine operations generally, has been investigated (see Excursus I. and XIV.); and results (it is believed) are brought out, which present a scheme of great simplicity, uniformity and harmony—a scheme which deals fairly with all the aspects of revealed religion, as well as with the phenomena of natural religion —a scheme, no less in symmetry and consistency with Scripture-sentiment, than in perfect accord with the certitudes of well-ascertained truth generally.

It is impossible to detail the points discussed. I shall merely say that the first four chapters contain the germ of the main argumentation involved in the book: the latter four chapters supply Bible-illustrations or exemplifications, confirmatory of the interpretations and expositions contained in the former. The Excursus, as being superinduced reflections, chiefly suggested by a re-perusal of the first four chapters, deal pretty much in philosophical as well as theological matter—matter brought in for further elucidation—matter having a close and interesting bearing upon the creed of the Church, or rather on the healthier apprehension of the creed of the Church. It would perhaps be well if ordinary readers were to leave the perusal of the introductory chapter to the end.

I have only to remark in conclusion, that, while adopting an independent course in interpreting the

Digitized by Google

Scriptures (the only course whereby I could test my own position), it has been my unspeakable comfort to find, not only an entire harmony of the Word of God with itself, but that its teaching, as thus brought out, is in fundamental and substantial agreement with the purest and best schooling of my own Church; and my humble, earnest prayer to God has been, and is, that, for Christ's sake, and His own glory's sake, He will bless what is now sent forth, so far as it shall serve to promote the cause of His Kingdom.

G. J.

THE MANSE, OLD ABERDEEN,
October, 1884.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

Creeds.

They intimate doctrines, 1—They do not give to them a scientific aspect, 2—Westminster Confession presents a logical consistency, but contains incongruities, 2 — Broad churchism: Scepticism, 3—Scientific theology described: aimed at, 4—Changes may be made in creeds, but the Bible is unchanged: error must be yielded up, 5.

Fundamental Difficulties or Deficiences in Creeds:

(1) *As to the doctrine of Justification.*

Justification: how connected with the death of Christ, 5—First applicable to Christ personally, 6—Death: its nature: cannot be the cause of life, 8—Death of Christ: Westminster Confession on, 10—The blood of Christ (the ransom-money) explained, 11—An objective process cannot be our justification, otherwise than through subjective application, 12.

(2) *As to the doctrine of Eternity.*

Succession in God, reasons for believing this, 13, 17—God can be thought of only according to our rational and moral nature, 14—Saisset on the character of Divine thought, 14—Time defined, 15, 19—Space defined, 16—Time and space in God: they have their foundation in eternity and infinity, 16—Duration, what? 18—The anthropological view of God indispensable, 19.

Digitized by Google

(3) *As to the Decrees of God.*

Foreknowledge in God, distinguished from foreordination, 20—Foreordination impossible apart from a certain foreknowledge, 20—Intelligence the ground of will, 19, 22—Neither Calvinism nor Arminianism the true ideal, 22, 30—Foreknowledge of two kinds, 21—First, that of possibilities; second, that arising from foreordination, 22—Key to the process of foreordination, 22—Decrees: each linked with its own motive: their allocation logical in the Divine mind, 23—The fall foreseen by God as inevitable, 24—Had to be met, 25, 26—This foreknowledge the ground of the foreordination of Christ, 27—Predestination of man: its true place, 27—Decrees of God: the grounds of Divine election, 29—they are possible of exposition, 28—Incongruities avoided, 30.

(4) *As to the Atonement.*

Substitution, not God's method, 31—Merit: none in man naturally, 31—Atonement: its proper foundation and causality, 32—how possible in Christ, 33—Christ made sin, and yet without sin, 34—How sin was put away, 35—Reformation defended as appealing to the Scriptures only, yet injustice done them, 36—The Church, the body of Christ: must now suffer sacrifice, 37.

(5) *As to Creation.*

Deeper arcana: Divine personality questioned by some, 38—Forces of nature, how they have their play; Ether, a universal medium, 39—Ether not to be characterised as matter, 40—matter and spirit defined, 41—Objective and subjective have each an eternal basis in primal substance, the former gives birth to matter, the latter gives birth to mind, 42—Primitive substance: its prerogatives, 43—Condition defined, 44—Atoms: not eternal, 44—not indestructible, 45—compared to letter-type, 48—not divisible in infinitum, 50—Matter: its connection with Ether, 49—how therein a correlation of forces, 51—Force, its initiation, 52—Substance: its primitive categories; consciousness, whence derived, 53—Man: amicrocosm of the objective and subjective in personal unity, 54, 66—Qualities: the attribute of substance, things made up of qualities, the basis of truths, 54—Form the organ of quality, and therefore

Digitized by Google

the organ of operation, 55—Impersonality and Personality: the absolute negative and the absolute positive, 56—Spinoza, 58—Hindoo theology, 59—Hegel, 60—Evolution: its characteristic as distinct from creation, 61—its utter incapacity to shew whence mind emanates, 62—can be understood, only as expounded by the law of Causality, 63—Evolution cannot take a creature out of its own circle, 64—Pantheism: its difficulty in separating God from the world, 64—Spirit-substance: a new philosophy through this intuition, 66—Matter and spirit, 67—Force, the principle on which it functions, 70—Soul: its foundation and its crowning property, 71—Ideas and will: how these are accounted for, 72—Conscience defined: its foundation, 73—The *me*: of necessity carnal in its foundation, how made spiritual, 74—Freedom: how possessed by man, 75—In what it consists, 76—Science: the handmaid of theology, 79—The forerunner of true Scripture interpretation, 80—The coming era, 81.

CHAPTER I.

The Incarnation of Christ.

The Incarnation, the channel of death to Christ, 83—Immortality: its true grounds, 84—Christ had our mortal body, 88, 95—Sinful flesh: its meaning, 89—The law of members, 90—Flesh and blood, 91—Christ's participation of these, 93—Their sameness in Christ as in us, 94—The constitution of Christ as sin-bearer, 96—Redemption: not a work of mere power, 99—Incarnation the basis of any scheme of atonement, 100, 115—Christ's body, 105—The victim which Christ had to offer, 102, 104, 112—Antichrist: what? 108—The Word, who? 110—The Word made flesh, 111—Christ the sin-bearer and the sin-destroyer, 113.

CHAPTER II.

Liabilities of Flesh and Blood.

Faithful interpretation demanded, 116—Flesh and Blood of Christ emphatically ours, 118—Circumcision of Christ: its significance, 121—Handwriting of Ordinances: what? 122—Incar-

Digitized by Google

nation of Christ involved a special work for Him, 124—Its performance the overturning of the devil's work, 125—The body of man: at creation, 126—The human constitution, 127, 131—The body gives complexion to the soul, 128—The will, on what grounded, 130, 139—The moral will, 132—Discipline demanded of man in his created state, 133—The soul had to be prepared for a celestial state, 135—First parents: how instigated to eat forbidden fruit, 136—The process of the Fall, 137—Satan's first task, 138—The Fall susceptible of explanation, 141.

CHAPTER III.

The Nature and Origin of Evil.

Christ, the representative of humanity, 145—The second Adam, 146—The Fall: in what circumstances a necessity, 147—Man made for development to immortality, 149—Antagonistic elements, 150—their operation: The foundation of will, 151—The blame attachable to our first parents, 153—The change wrought on them, 154—Conscience: its varieties according to knowledge, 155—Moral discernment and moral law, 156—Man fallen: his native condition, 158—Original sin, 159—Its consequences, 160—Life carnal, 160—Life spiritual, 161—Atonement: definition essential, 162—Man as created, 163—Man when fallen, 165—Sin of man compared with the sin of devils, 167—Sin that may be forgiven and sin that may not, 168—Incarnation touched not the case of devils, but of man, 169—Flesh and blood: and new flesh and blood, 170.

CHAPTER IV.

Christ Destroying the Work of the Devil.

he dogma of substitution, 174—Not the doctrine of the Church, 175—Christ's work: its application essential, 176—Sprinkling of blood, 177—The consequences of substitution, 178—Atonement: its principles, 180—Body and soul: spirit, what? 181—Soul, what? 182—Jesus Christ in the flesh, 183—In

Digitized by Google

the form of God, 184—Made sin, 185—Phil. ii. 6, 7, interpreted, 186—The work of Satan destroyed, 188—Discerning the Lord's body, 189—The foundation of justification, 190—The finished work of Christ, 191—The Mosaic dispensation preparatory to the Christian, 193—The death of the flesh, 194: in Christ, 195—This took away sin, 196—Suffering not atonement: its relation in the process of sacrifice, 199—Christ perfected: the way of Christ must be trodden by us, 201—The application of Atonement: the sprinkling of blood, 202.

CHAPTER V.

The True Tabernacle.

Two tabernacles, 207—Their furniture, 209—Their separate importance, 210—The High Priest a type of Christ, 213—Views of commentators, 214-222—The tabernacles in the Christian economy, 222—An outer body and an inner body, 225-228—Which made for immortality, 231—The soul mortal or immortal accordingly, 232. Two ministries: The fulfilment of Christ's work in two bodies, 235—Outer to be destroyed that the inner may stand, 239—The Christian's life on earth sacrificial: The body to be sacrificed, 241—in Christ, 243. The lesson of sacrifice, 244—Atonement: Its true features in Christ, 247—Its application, 249—Service in the sanctuary, 250. Service in the sanctuary typified service in the body, 250—Its significance, 252. Sin has to be slain, 255—How Christ did this, 256—Spirit-forms: what constitutes, 257—Spirit-body of Christ produced in us: the germ of the resurrection-body, 258.

CHAPTER VI.

The Doctrine of Sacrifice.

Sacrifice: in Christ essential to His glory, 260—in us demanded by discipleship, 261—Analogy of seed-corn, 262—sacrifice in the natural world, 263—The lower nature must give way to the higher, 264—Death demanded, 266—in Christ made room for the new body, 269—applicable to all, 273—The process: four

Digitized by Google

circumstantials, 274—Death the preliminary to life, 275, 282—Drummond's difficulty of conforming to the type expounded, 276—Death of Christ must be seen in us, 277, 283. The life of Christ the foundation of our life, 279—The Church, the body of Christ, conformed to the Type, 280—Substitution contrary to the principles of Scripture, 284—Suffering with Christ, 285—Fellowship with Christ, 287—Resurrection power, 288—Analogy of our case with that of Christ, 289—German reformation inadequate, 291.

CHAPTER VII.

The Cross of Christ.

The Cross of Christ: Not the material cross, 296—involved suffering, the crying on the cross expounded, 297—Christ recoiled from suffering, 299—The cross not simply humiliation, 301—defined, 302, 320—Opposition from Satan, 304—from the world, 307—from the flesh, 309—Discipline ministered to Christ, 310—Sinful impulses not reckoned sin when checked, 313—How Christ applied the cross to Himself, 316—Christ checked retaliation, 316—faced persecution, 317—practised sacrifice, 318—Sufferings not an atonement, 321—His redemption made ours, 322—Christ as distinguished from the cross, 323—The title to Heaven involved in the qualification for Heaven, 324—Sprinkling, the symbol of applying Christ's blood to us, 325—Justification and sanctification distinguished, 327—The two doctrines of the cross, 328—The cross as putting away sin, 330.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Remission of Sins.

Remission of Sins: Reason must be satisfied, 333—The meaning of, 335—involves the doctrine of Atonement, 336, 344—Mistakes as to Justification, 337—Imputation, 338, 355—Cleansing antecedent to pardon, 339—Effect always preceded by its cause, 340—Sin as a debt, 341—The ground of forgiveness, 343—The blood of Christ, what? and how sprinkled? 345,

Digitized by Google

357—Christ's Saviourship, when established, 349—The service on the great day of Atonement, 352—The fulfilment by Christ, 354—Christ made sin yet without sin, 355—The process of effecting remission, 357—The attitude of Creeds, 363—Arminianism and Calvinism, 364—Substitution excluded, 365—Grounds of election to faith, 366—Divine grace and human freedom, 369.

EXCURSUS I.

On the Divine Decrees.

The Decrees of God: A Creed without reference to decrees, a defect, 373—Creeds refer these to the Sovereign pleasure of God, 374—The Sovereignty of God ordered by moral law, 375—Righteousness dearer to God than Sovereignty, 376—Decrees a necessity essential to the Divine character, 377—Foreknowledge and foreordination in close connection, 379—They lie in the categories of Intelligence and Will, 381—The Divine mind must work under motives, 382—in the works of creation, 383—The foreknowledge of possibilities the ground of the foreordination of realities, 384—The concept must exist before its outward realisation, 385—Fresh foreknowledge of things foreordained give rise to new foreordinations, 386—Man's need of immortality, the ground of its provision, 387—The fall of man foreseen: hence provision to meet it, 389—The foundation of Divine election to life, 390—Repentance the preparation for the exercise of faith, 392—The objects of Divine selection, 394—The Church freed from difficulty by sound views, 395

EXCURSUS II.

On the Ground of Human Immortality.

Human Immortality: Not derived from the body, 398, 402—Spirit-substance, its primary attributes, 399—The foundation of the Ego, its furniture, 401—The true ground of immortality, the word of God, 403.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS III.

Christ's Literal Incarnation

Christ's Literal Incarnation: Mr. Bingham's views discussed, 405—His quotation from Mr. Dods, 409—Remarks on the above: Scripture passages considered, 410—Christ, how made sin, 411—The ground of His victory, 412.

EXCURSUS IV.

The Immaculate Conception.

Mary not Immaculate: Not conscious of the required discipline for this end, 413.

EXCURSUS V.

The Connection of Body and Soul.

Consciousness the highest evidence of the fact, 414—Impressions from the Holy Ghost, 415—The soul is the creature of that which begets its form, 416—Soul-transformation, 417—The soul has its complexion radically from the body, afterwards from the Spirit, 418.

EXCURSUS VI.

The Nature of Redemption.

The soul in redemption has deliverance first of all from the dominion of the flesh, 420—The flesh has to die first *relatively*, and in the end *absolutely*, 421—Redemption to the body comes after redemption to the soul, 422—Redemption of Christ, how made applicable to us, 423.

EXCURSUS VII.

The Foundations of Priesthood.

Sacrifice, the essential office of a priest: the sacrifice of sin indispensable, 424—How it was possible for Christ to sacrifice sin,

Digitized by Google

425—The danger of questioning this, 426—The alternative, if Christ had nothing to be sacrificed, 427—Christ's priesthood made ours, 428.

EXCURSUS VIII.

CHRIST AS PRIEST AND AS VICTIM.

Heb. ix. 12 examined, 429—The redemption effected by Christ personally, 430—The work of the devil being radically in the flesh, Christ destroyed this, 432—The Priest and the Victim not to be confounded, 433.

EXCURSUS IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTATION.

An interpretation which has no Scripture authority, 434—Imputation without Impartation subversive of faith, 435—Imputation implies "Christ in us," 436—of sin to Christ, 437—The soul of Christ antagonistic to sin, 439—Imputation and impartation inseparable, 441—The conflict in Christ, 442.

EXCURSUS X.

CHRIST MADE UNDER THE LAW.

Christ made of a woman, 444—The law under which Christ was born, 445—Christ fulfilled the law in making the carnal subservient to the spiritual, 447—Proofs of the doctrine here expounded, 448.

EXCURSUS XI.

THE NATURE OF ATONEMENT.

This central theme beclouded with difficulties, 453—The reason of this, 454—The carnal state not adapted for immortality, 455—Christ made man, 456—What in Christ equipped Him for priesthood, 457—His justification, 458—Our justification when we are in Christ, 460—Regeneration implies atonement,

Digitized by Google

461—The need of the Church to be instructed, 462—Christ's sacrifice expounded, 463.

EXCURSUS XII.

THE HANDWRITING OF ORDINANCES.

Col. ii. 14, 15, specially considered: Opinions of Commentators, 465—The handwriting a transcript on the soul from the flesh, 467—Olshausen's view analysed, 468—The handwriting with respect to Christ, 469, 479—Rom. vii. expounded, 470-474—2 Cor. iii. 6, expounded, 475, 480—Olshausen at times close upon the truth, 476—Christ effected what the law of Moses could not do, 481—The handwriting interpreted, 482.

EXCURSUS XIII.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM.

The doctrine of Substance a possible philosophy: This denied by Hamilton, 483—All evidence lies in consciousness: The different classes of consciousness, 484—Perception the medium of the most convincing consciousness, 485—Certain results of reasoning, coming through perception, equally convincing: Causality defined, 487—The Duke of Argyll on the acquisition of truth, 488—Causality the object of philosophers, 489—The sources of operation in matter and mind, what? 490—Force defined: The views of the Duke of Argyll, Professor Tait and Mr. Sprague, 491—Substance primordially must be a spirit-medium: Its attributes, 492—Primitive beinghood, 493—Definitions of spirit-substance, and of matter, 495—Ether regarded as spirit-substance yet the mother-substance of matter: Its characteristics, 496—Ether, the universal medium for the qualities of matter, 497—This exemplified by all the cosmical forces, 498—The properties of Ether farther set forth, 499-504—The basis of mind set forth, 505—Mind distinguished from matter, 506—The development of matter and of mind from primitive substance, 507—Souls of necessity are of a spirit-nature, 508—The formative conditions of a soul-personality, 509—Tyndall on the basis of souls and on natural law, 510—

Digitized by Google

Tyndall's facts admitted: Conclusions therefrom, 511—The foundations of soul reviewed, 513—The substance-qualities of a soul as at once Etherial and Intellectual, 515—The operations of souls as Intelligence, 516—The operations of souls as Will, 519—The source of motives and their varied character, 519—The checks and counter-checks in the formation of will, 520—The operation of primary and secondary ideas as sources of emotion, 520, 523—The foundation of morals, 521—The philosophy of will epitomised, 523—Man's spiritual nature analogous to his moral nature, 524.

EXCURSUS XIV.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WILL IN MAN.

The common failure in duly discussing this subject, 526—There can be no freedom seen in looking at causation, 526—The nature and character of law, 527—Freedom lies in the formation of causation, 528—Freedom lies in the adoption or repudiation of a motive, 529—The foundations of the *ought* and *ought not*, 529—The definitions of Free Will examined, 530—The free agency of man under the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, 532.

EXCURSUS XV.

THE FALL OF SATAN AND HIS FELLOW ANGELS.

The fall of Satan distinguished from that of Adam, 535—The fundamental motive which generated the fall of Satan, 536—Reasons for God trying the obedience of Angels, 537—The character of Satan's sin as compared with Adam's, 538.

EXCURSUS XVI.

THE POSSESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Misconceptions on this subject, 539—The foundation of this prerogative, 540—Will dependent on Intelligence, 541—This true as regards a godly will, 542—The process of obtaining the Holy Ghost, 542—What constitutes the possession of the Holy Ghost, 543.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XVII.

The Processes of Mind. (Synopsis.)

A summary of cosmical laws applicable to the constitution of personality, 545—The law of morals specially considered: its foundation, 549—"Eternal verities" so-called: their source and foundation, 550—Truth defined, 551—The first law of reason, 551—Will, invariably springs from emotion, 552—Emotion of two general kinds, according to the idea from which it emanates, 552—Ideas primary and secondary: their origin, 552—Moral law as a rule induced through secondary ideas, 554—Moral emotions, how originated, 555—Result in moral will, 556.

EXCURSUS XVIII.

Man Created: Man Fallen: and Man Restored.

Personification, its foundation, not by evolution, 557 — Reasons against the theory of evolution, 558—Evolution, its capacity and limitations, 559—Pre-existing types expressly built upon, 560—Mere moral behests incapable of contributing spirituality, 560—Man, how linked on to the spirit-world, 561—The condition of man fallen, 562—How this condition is of necessity a state of sin, 563—Carnal exactions developed in the soul, 564—The knowledge of sin in order to a knowledge of the remedy, 565—The process of restoration, 565.

EXCURSUS XIX.

Unclean Spirits, and the Sin against the Holy Ghost.

The foundation of this sin, 567—The fallen condition of man, not thus characterised, 568—The liability of man to fall into this condition, 569—The process in man reaching this state, 570—The sin against the Holy Ghost described, 571—The possibility of Satan's fall pointed out, 572—The grounds on which the rebel angels likely fell, 573.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XX.

The Process which Leads to Regeneration.

The natural man's propension, 574—The first point in conversion is conviction of sin, 575—Hence God first of all introduces a dispensation of sacrifice, as a dispensation of repentance, 576—Thereafter a dispensation of faith for the appropriation of the things of Christ, 577.

EXCURSUS XXI.

The Unchangeableness of God in the Process of Atonement.

The fundamental idea of Atonement, 578—God is the arbiter of good and evil, 579—The reconcilement of man to God is fundamental; and this consists in the putting away of sin, 579—The work of Christ lay in destroying the work of the devil, and so in taking away of the offence, of reconciling the manhood to God, 580.

EXCURSUS XXII.

Eating the Flesh and Drinking the Blood of Christ.

The passage, John vi. 53-58, cannot refer to the Lord's Supper, 581—To eat carnal flesh cannot give spiritual life, 582—The dispensation of God represented to the Jews spiritual things through *visible* things, 582—Difficult even now to separate these, 583—Romanists err in two ways, 584—The nature of Christ's true and eternal body, 585—In what way we obtain this true and eternal body of Christ, 587—The resurrection to life takes place under the acquisition of the body of Christ, 588—How Christ is formed in believers, 589—This, as the new life, is now only in process, 590—As to Christ, He was exalted when He was put to death in the flesh and quickened in the spirit, *i.e.*, when He attained the goal of a perfected humanity, 590—The analogy in our case in our being crucified with Him, 591—The aim and intention of the institution of

Digitized by Google

the Lord's Supper was to teach the necessity of our dying to sin and of our being quickened to righteousness, 592—The idea seems monstrous of eating carnal flesh, 593—The offer made to us is that of Christ as He is, 594—Reasons against the idea of material flesh and blood, 595.

EXCURSUS XXIII.

The Doctrine of Substitution.

Substitution: a term not found in our standards, 596—The benefits of Christ's work become ours only when we *receive* them, and so have Christ *applied* to us, 597—The application of Christ dependent on the equipment of Christ for this end, 598—The dilemmas into which the Church has been plunged by the dogma of substitution, 598—Further reasons against substitution, 599—No substitution proclaimed in the Old Testament economy, but the contrary, 600—The lesson taught by the Old Testament sacrifices, and the lesson taught by the New Testament sacrifice, one and the same, 601—Paul learned the lesson when he could say, I am crucified with Christ, 602—Christ the central object, the foundation, after which His disciples have to be conformed, 602—The doctrine of substitution rests on two mistaken assumptions, 603—The inconsistency of regarding the death upon the cross as an assurance of substitution, instead of being a lesson of adhesion to the divine law in the face of the bitterest sufferings, 603—The suffering of pain no atonement, but simply the inevitable experience attached to atonement, 604.

EXCURSUS XXIV.

Christ Made Sin.

"Christ made sin," and "Christ without sin": two contradictory propositions cannot both be true as applicable to the self-same point, 605—What is meant by the expression "Christ made sin," not a putative assumption, 606—Passages expounded in which sin is applied to Christ (Rom. viii. 3): the sense in

Digitized by Google

which Christ was made sin, 607—The danger of denying this conclusion, 608—Christ condemned sin in the flesh, 609—Christ when He had procured the redemption of the flesh, that is, when perfected, linked Himself on to us by the preaching of the gospel, 609—We have to be conformed to His death, 610—Another passage (Eph. ii. 15) in which Christ is said to have taken "the flesh of sin" expounded, 610—The enmity in the flesh of Christ, termed "the law of (carnal) commandments in their decrees" or demands, He abolished, 611—What is meant by Christ having made both one, 612—Christ, as subject to the claims of the divine law, had to answer its charges and to satisfy its claims, 613—The seventh chapter to the Romans points to the two contending principles whereby the Jew was assailed, and shews how the Mosaic oracles were weak to control the dominion of the flesh; it further shews how the divine power in Christ was efficacious for this end, 614—Hence the Mosaic husband is removed, and Christ as the new husband is substituted as the Lawgiver that we may be conformed to Him, 615—Christ waged the battle and overcame: so we in Him, that is by the application of His grace, have to be presented holy and without blemish before God, 616.

EXCURSUS XXV.

Justification and Sanctification through the Remission of Sins.

The number of passages in which the terms "Remission" and "Forgiveness" are found in the Old and New Testaments, 618—The meaning of the terms in the Hebrew, with their Greek equivalents in the Septuagint, 619—What comes forth from Old Testament teaching, 620—The meaning of the Greek terms in the New Testament, and what comes forth from its teaching, 621—What blood of Christ it is that removeth sin, 622—The process whereby this is effected, 623—Justification expounded, 624—It of necessity implies our sanctification, 625—Two kinds of righteousness unwarrantably devised, 626—One kind of righteousness shown as alone possible, 627—Faith the operation which receives righteousness, hence the true meaning of imputation, 628.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PRELIMINARY CHAPTER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PRELIMINARY CHAPTER.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE DOCTRINES HEREIN SUPPORTED.

THERE is a general agreement among the Creeds of the Reformation in regard to what may be called the central doctrines of Theology. With minor modifications, they hold that the Bible possesses supreme authority for the Church, as containing the revelation of God; and that the interpretation of the Bible is best attained by comparing Scripture with Scripture: that man was created by God with the law of life prescribed to him, and that he fell from the fulfilment of that law, by disobedience: that God having a foreknowledge of the Fall, foreordained the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in human form to repair the ruin of the Fall: that the fulfilment of this decree constituted a process of atonement, at once establishing and honouring and satisfying the gracious law, under which man was made, as altogether holy and just and good: that hereby a foundation was laid for the redemption of man from his low, lost and helpless condition, as a fallen creature: that while God called on all men everywhere to repent, and in this general call manifested no election of one before another, some were arrested, and specially selected and elected to become believers in Jesus Christ, and through faith

Digitized by Google

to have Jesus Christ applied to them, that is, to become partakers of Him and of His righteousness, for their salvation and ultimate glorification. Those great doctrines are strictly and strongly upheld and supported in the pages of this volume.

But the object of penning them will be far from being accomplished, if there be merely a statement of doctrine which has been hundreds of times repeated. Attention is called to the fact that the creeds of the Reformation (and the Westminster Confession, and the Thirty-nine Articles, with which we, in this country, are chiefly concerned, are among the latest), do not pretend to set forth divine doctrine, under what may be called a scientific aspect, that is an aspect which presents cause and effect as standing together in due symmetry, and in necessary sequence. True: it may be said, however, and it has been often said, that the scheme of doctrine, as advanced by the Westminster Confession, does present and preserve a logical consistency throughout. What then? It frankly acknowledges, as it unmistakably contains, incongruities; and it is precluded from explaining the incongruities; first, in that it feels it incumbent to bow to the revealed word; and second, by simply referring all to the supremacy of the divine will. The question then forces itself upon us: Can the Church always remain content with incongruities? while holding the supremacy of Holy Scripture, as the same is purified from human admixture, and holding the infallibility of divine statements: can the Church, as she progresses by increased enlightenment, become released from the maintenance of incongruities?

The answer given to this question is sufficiently

Digitized by Google

patent in the case of not a few; and it is found in the term "Broad Churchism," which means, let every man follow his own individual persuasion. Broad churchism has in it the elements of charity, in that it yields to a brother the liberty which a man assumes to himself; it is the principle of toleration carried into practical exercise; and in the circumstances of a standard of true unity being wanting, it is infinitely to be preferred to the compulsory methods of bye-gone days with persecutions. But "Broad Churchism" is at best but a temporary compromise. There is but "one faith" revealed, and there can be but one truth; and Broad Churchism bears the word *disunion* on its front. In the bosom of Broad Churchism there is a large amount of undeveloped scepticism, a scepticism no less inconsistent with the teaching of Scripture and of our creeds, than selfishness and immorality are inconsistent with the requirements of Christianity. One evil of our disunion is (and our creeds, as adjusted, have doubtless their share in connection with this lamentable phenomenon) the failure of the churches to bring about the Regeneration of the world. Assuredly, if the Bible be from God (and we profoundly believe that it is), it can be satisfied with nothing less than an entire change of heart and of life on the great body of the community. There is no doubt that an avowed conservation of the Bible largely prevails, and a general reverence is allowed to it, and a consequent Christian professionalism exists; yet that professionalism, while itself imperfect, as an inadequate exhibition of faith, is being otherwise rudely shaken—partly by the materialistic dogmas propagated by certain leading scientists, and partly by the intellectual difficulties attending certain supposed Christian

Digitized by Google

doctrines. If in these circumstances of doubt and perplexity to many minds, "historic criticism" should succeed in breaking down implicit faith in the inspiration and integrity of the Sacred Scriptures, the disaster to our Christianity would meanwhile be very serious and distressing.

The aim of the following pages is to present a Scientific Theology—a theology, not only systematised on logical principles, preserving a mutual harmony throughout all its parts, but each part based on Scripture-statement, as in harmony with scientific advancement, and sound philosophical argument—a theology in which cause and effect can be fairly traced in symmetrical order[1]—a theology, in short, in which the grand revealments of Gospel-truth shall be preserved intact, amid the smaller modifications, which, as a connected scheme of thought, our creeds are of necessity destined to undergo. The Bible, we are convinced, will stand essentially unharmed: its inspiration, for the purposes

[1] When we speak of cause and effect, we ought distinctly to understand what these words mean. Cause always necessitates a combination of two or more factors for its operation; and these operate according to the nature of the ingredients of which the factors are composed, and the nature of the relationship in which they may happen to be placed in the combination. The phenomenon which is produced by the operation of the combined ingredients is called the effect. It may be noted that when once a constitution is framed—framed by the combination of many ingredients as separate factors therein, as, for example, our bodily system, when any extraneous factor comes in, and bears upon that constitution, and thereby produces a change, the factor in virtue of which the change takes place is popularly spoken of as cause. For example, "he went out and caught cold," is but saying that the application of the cold atmosphere to the living frame as constructed, constitutes the cause of the change, that is, of the effect thus produced in the system.

Digitized by Google

of spiritual religion, will, under all proper investigation, be abundantly confirmed; and it will be found that it requires (through our advanced knowledge in questions of science) but the application of the principles of a simple, natural and grammatical interpretation to secure its ultimate triumph in the world. That there will be a contest, bitter and severe it may be, before denominations will give up their shibboleths; and more especially before infidelity, presently sheltering itself under the wing of supposed science, will own itself defeated, is to be expected; but "truth is great, and it will prevail," as the boundaries of knowledge come to be enlarged.

The fundamental difficulties, applicable to the system of thought propounded, or supposed to be presented, by our prevailing creeds, will not be found to lie in the mere doctrines considered by themselves, as articles of faith, and as unquestionable truths, of our holy religion revealed in the sacred Scriptures; but rather in their allocation and connection, that is in the relationship in which they are made to stand to one another; for their allocation, as they presently stand, would set forth alleged causes, which are not, and cannot be the exponents of the effects, which are said to follow from them. As an exemplification of this statement, it may be noted that our Justification is ascribed for the most part popularly to a cause, which by itself is purely *objective;* while the real and immediate cause must needs in the nature of things lie in the subjective *application* of the objective element. We must first have a clear and distinct idea of what constitutes cause, as being the *conjunction* or *combination* of two or more ingredients, as factors in order to produce a result. If justification, then, means fundamentally the taking away

Digitized by Google

of our sins, and in connection with this, the imputation, and therefore the implied impartation, of the righteousness of Christ, there must needs be the *sprinkling* or application of the blood of Christ for this end. It cannot be that the outside, abstract, bare, *objective* fact, *viz.*, that Christ Jesus died upon the tree, should constitute our justification: it cannot be that any mere *external* fact should be productive of effects, apart from the *application* of the fact to the man in whom the change is effected. The objective fact may properly be regarded as the necessary ground from which we obtain the cause, but the mere ground apart from its application cannot be the cause: yet we are accustomed to say "the death of Christ is the life of His people". It is strictly a misappropriation of terms to say that death is the cause of life. "It is Christ that died, *yea rather that was raised from the dead*, who is at the right hand of God": "he was delivered up [to death] for our trespasses, and was *raised for our justification*".

Here we see that the Scriptures do not confound two essentially separate departments. The causality in each case is distinct and appropriate. On the one hand we have the great objective fact of Christ's death, as a phenomenon on earth, sin being laid on Him: on the other hand we have the great subjective fact of our justification as likewise a phenomenon on earth, righteousness being imparted to us. How can we directly conjoin the two (death in Christ and life in us) in a causal nexus? It cannot be done, save in one way, *viz.*, by regarding the whole matter as a purely commercial transaction, and say it is simply and solely the paying of debt. It is most true that our sins are in Scripture spoken of as debts, that is offences, which have to be removed in

Digitized by Google

order to satisfy God; but will anyone say that our offences have been removed by the death of Christ? It stands as a fact, that man is now born in sin, and grows up in sin, till it is taken away by the *application* of Christ. The death of Christ (we speak not here of the external concomitants) was itself an effect produced by its own appropriate cause, *viz.*, "the eternal Spirit through whom He offered Himself unto God," *i.e.*, as partaking of what is ours, *i.e.*, as incarnated in our flesh, under which death the spiritual life of Christ was thus free to enter, in all its purity into the regions of everlasting bliss. The new life of believers is in like manner an effect produced by its own appropriate cause, *viz.*, the impartation by sprinkling of what is called "the precious blood of Christ," that is the essentials of the life of Christ which man receives by faith for his healing. That which caused the death of Christ was our condition of offensiveness, assumed by His incarnation, whereby He became amenable to the curse of the law; hence He is said to have "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself": He could only put away sin by being "made sin". Being made sin, by bearing the burden of sin, and enduring the trials of sin, as unquestionably He did, He suffered the sacrifices which were incident thereto, during His life on the earth, and finally, as the climax and the close of the work given Him to do, He offered up the body of the flesh upon the tree,—itself the emblem of the cross which He had encountered through life; and hereby He fulfilled all the demands of Heaven, and was received up into glory.

This reception of the man Christ Jesus into glory now constituted the foundation out of which new life accrued to us. Having by His *officiation to God* acquired as

Digitized by Google

man the power of an endless life, His aim and purpose now came to be an *officiation to man*, through the application of the very process which, in His own person, constituted the foundation of human salvation. Hence it is said we must be "crucified with Christ": "we must die with Him, that we may live with Him": "we must bear the cross": we must "bear about with us the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Christ may be manifested in our mortal bodies": we must "put on the new man, which after Christ is created in righteousness and true holiness". How is this effected? First, by the exercise of Repentance as one of the saving graces, whereby we "die unto sin"; and second, on the back of this, by the exercise of Faith as another of the saving graces, whereby we "live unto righteousness"; and in either case, the exercise is produced by the interposition of God. In this way we obtain a causality which constitutes a sound and natural sequence of the working of cause and effect. We must repeat, therefore, it is a misnomer to say that "death is the cause of life". Death may be essential in order to give freedom to life; but death always and invariably implies destruction,—the destruction of something that has to be taken out of the way, and cannot therefore be regarded as the direct cause of life. Death is a phenomenon final and complete: it can therefore no longer operate as a cause: it can only give room or scope for the operation of cause.

It is said, and truly, that if there were no death there could be no life, and this holds good in the realm of nature. The analogy of a seed of corn falling into the ground and dying, that new life may be produced, is a case in point. We find in the circumstances that the meal or nutriment which is in the husk of the grain is

Digitized by Google

absorbed and swallowed up, and consequently destroyed, and the husk is left an empty shell; and hereby the death or destruction of the grain or seed is denoted. But this death cannot properly be regarded as the cause of the new life which we see springing up from the seed: on the contrary it simply gives scope for the formation of the new life, which has its source in the germ which is in the seed: death therefore supplies a ground for the production of the plant. Let it be noted, then, that the cause of this new life-production lies in the fact that there is fundamentally a germ which has to be developed; and the sap in the soil, combined with the heat carried to the soil, constitute the immediate cause of the new life in question. So the death of Christ, more especially as a phenomenon outside of us, is not the cause of our life; but it was the essential ground out of which His own true life was manifested; and that true life being now manifested as the tree of life, "the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations," we have from Christ glorified the vouchsafement of that "grace which bringeth salvation," the impartation of that "gospel wherein we stand, and by which we are saved if we keep in memory the things" proclaimed to us. That "Christ died for us" is a truth that cannot be too emphatically stated, for apart from His death, there could not have been the manifestation of His glorified life; but it is directly out of His glorified life that we have the causal elements of our salvation. It behoved Christ to die, and the death He underwent was expressly *with the view to* our life (ὑπερ ἡμῶν); but the phenomenon which denotes demolition, downfall, ruin (and the body of the flesh was completely destroyed when He tore the veil of the flesh), cannot be made the direct

Digitized by Google

cause of our life; for this is as much as to say, that something, which is reduced to nothing, can become a cause, and the cause too of the very opposite of itself.

What has given occasion, and still gives occasion, to the misinterpretation of scripture-revelation on this great subject is such language as the following:— "Christ by His obedience and death did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to His Father's justice in their behalf. Yet in as much as He was given by the Father for them, and His obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners." *(Westminster Confession of Faith, C. II., § 3.)*

Here, beyond all question, our justification is ascribed not only to a cause purely objective—a cause which stands wholly outside of us—a cause in which God is made to pay to Himself what was due for the debts of man, or rather for the sins of the elect—a cause that is said to operate in behalf of many before they had any being to be operated upon—a cause therefore operating in circumstances before it can exist as cause, in as far as it does not reach, and cannot reach, or even touch, the object whose relation to God is said to be hereby changed. It may be said that, in the circumstances, the relation in which man stands to God comes to be changed by the obedience and death of Christ, if man's debts are in truth hereby paid; that is, if the claim God has upon man is hereby discharged; that is, if the sins of man are in point of fact removed. But there is nothing of the sort! This "if" involves

Digitized by Google

the whole question. It is admitted that the sin of man remains—that he is now born in sin—that, left to himself, he grows up in sin—that the sin of man implies the debt—that the debt therefore is really not discharged, in as far as the sin of man is not sacrificed—that the debt can be discharged in one way only, by its removal, *i.e.*, by the removal of our sin—that there is but one way of removing sin, and that is by the painful process of sacrificing or destroying it—that there is but one way of destroying it, *viz.*, by the sprinkling of the precious blood of Christ upon the sinner for his justification. This blood of Christ (it is freely admitted) is "the money" of Christ whereby alone our debt is discharged, and it is the money paid to God, as that which is alone effectual for the ransom of sin; and is paid in the only way in which it can be paid to be effectual for the ransom of man. Let it, moreover, be noted that the blood of Christ's earthly body can never be regarded as the atoning blood, which cleanses and purifies the soul:—

First, because the blood of the body is the blood of the flesh, the blood which had to be poured out in order to the accomplishment of death:—

Second, because said blood was in point of fact the blood of Mary, the blood which "profiteth nothing," and which as matter of fact is not sprinkled upon us, and could not cleanse us if it were; but the life-blood that essentially belonged to Christ as the living and immortal One before the throne of God, as He ascended to the glory of the New Jerusalem—the life-blood, therefore, that was carried by our great High Priest into the Holy of Holies for acceptance—the life-blood that constitutes the source of the regenerative life, and

Digitized by Google

which has been shed forth from the heavens in order to its being applied to man: this is the sterling money of the Lord Jesus—the money which has been provided for the discharge of our debts: thus it truly comes to pass that, while Christ died for our sins (the burden of which He assumed by His incarnation), He "rose again for our justification," that is, to vouchsafe His righteousness to be made available to us for our justification.

It follows then most clearly that a purely objective process cannot be regarded as the cause of our justification: and here is the remarkable fact, that, though language had just been employed by the Confession of Faith, leading to this conclusion and to this conclusion alone, the Confession itself no sooner makes the statement now quoted, than it sees at once the difficulty in which it would thus come to be involved, and would of necessity involve it adherents; for it goes on in the immediately following section to say: "God did from all eternity decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did in the fulness of time die for their sins, and rise again for their justification: *nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them*". These words contain all for which we contend: they uphold our whole contention. We are made partakers of Christ by the Holy Spirit: we receive the essentials of Christ, as brought to us by the Holy Spirit; *i.e.*, we exercise faith and are made righteous thereby; that is, *we are justified by faith;* for it is through the exercise of faith that we receive the spirit-blood which constitutes the life of the new manhood. What then? In the all-important question of our justification, we have proved incongruity in our creed—incongruity, not merely in regard to the facts

Digitized by Google

which go to constitute causality, but with its own conclusions. It cannot be reconciled that Christ should fully pay the debt, whereby all claims against sinners were abundantly met, and consequently achieved their justification; and yet that justification should be suspended. It is making the divine claim to consist of a matter of abstract money-payment, apart from any transaction with the sinner: it is forgetting that the money-payment demanded by God must come directly through man himself; and it lies in this that a man "should sell all that he has" (give up all that is his own) to procure "the pearl of great price," which is the "gift of God," the purchase price of his redemption.

We have seen that a cause that is purely objective to the subject, in respect of which a change is effected, cannot be a cause at all, and we have seen that death, as such, cannot be the cause of life, because a cause must be something subsisting, whereas death is the removal of the something, of something which was at one time real, and is now by death rendered unreal, that is, as existing no more; and the unreal cannot operate as cause. We might further venture for a proof of what we have said on the question of incongruity, into an arena of still profounder consideration, but of enormous moment, in regard to the views which we are obliged to entertain respecting the divine dealings with us, and indeed respecting the attitude which God bears to His world and to His creatures therein. Many are much disposed, for example, to hold that there can be no Succession of thought in God, that there is to Him therefore no past, and present, and future, that duration is to Him without the element of time, and must be regarded in His

Digitized by Google

eyes as "one eternal now".[1] This, we are persuaded, is an entirely mistaken notion—first, because the facts of creation belie it; second, because the statements of Scripture do not support it; and third, because it is inconsistent with all that we know or can conceive respecting the operations of mind. We have therefore no proper alternative but to think of God according to the analogy of our own rational and moral nature, which, by the way, we are told, has been formed in the image or likeness of that of God. Unless we come to this finding, it is *a priori* obvious to us, that any attempts to examine into the schemes of God with respect to our world or ourselves, is, and must needs be, mystery; in fact, that our relation to God, in its most essential character, has no validity—that we can have no conception of His operations, and no sympathy with His mind,

[1] "Divine thought is thought fully developed, which by its essence is anterior to all development. Finite thought implies effort, infinite thought excludes it. Finite thought is displayed under the form of time, infinite thought subsists and is maintained under the form of eternity. It knows none of the conditions of an imperfect intelligence, nothing of limit or time or space or succession, consequently nothing of memory or reasoning or induction, or any of those human intermediaries between an infinite truth and a finite thought: nothing of those laborious operations which are the torment and confusion of our reason. It is but the pure essence of thought, adequate to being, intuition having consciousness of itself, thought taking hold of being, and taking hold of itself." (Saisset on *Modern Pantheism*, Vol. II., p. 52.) Such is the style of reasoning with which we are generally furnished, and with which we too often rest contented. Is there, can there be such a phenomenon as an "infinite thought"? And why mingle the laboriousness of thought with the characteristics of thought? And what kind of form is "the form of eternity"? If Divine thought knows nothing of limit, time, space, or succession, how came the things of creation forth?

Digitized by Google

as being of a character wholly foreign to ours. Such notions misrepresent God, and they forestall the impossibility of our reaching God, or of feeling our true relation to God. It is such notions that have gone to confound the fore-knowledge and fore-ordination of God, and which has thereby introduced all the difficulty wherewith we are surrounded in speaking of the decrees of God. It is such notions that have gone to perplex the question of human freedom in respect of divine operation and the fulfilment of the divine will. It must be of enormous moment, then, to understand upon principles that cannot be gainsaid, what are, and must be, the characteristics of the divine mind, as in consistency with all that is proclaimed to us of God, and with all that can be gathered of God from His Word and from His Works.

As to the facts of creation, we know that there was a time (and we must call it time) when these facts began to be—a time when they were not as they now exist—a time when one arose in subservience to another, and out of the proper causality, as pre-existing the phenomenal facts, in as far as it produced the facts: does it not necessarily follow that if God, as Creator, prescribed and in Himself constituted the causality of will in each separate case, in due subserviency to facts formally preordained, that there was of necessity before Him a process of what is properly called *time?* What is Time but the interval of duration betwixt one event and another? Time is transition. Time always marks eventuality; time is measured by eventuality. Are we to say, there is no eventuality with God? This is a pantheistic notion, full of incongruities; and goes to destroy the personality of God. Eventuality exists in the mere

Digitized by Google

variety of thought. If there be one thought in God as distinguished from another, this distinction of thought marks time. It is analogous to the question of Space. Were there not space as applicable to God, there could be no space as applicable to creation. Space is the measurement of extension: space consists in such measurement: it may begin with an atom; but there is no limit to its expansion. Were there not time and space as applicable to God, it is obvious that there could be no time and space introduced, that is, creation could not be introduced. Time and space are limitations essential to creation; but how could these exist at all, if they were not originally and intrinsically in God? Without the presentations of time and space in God, one would make God to be an imperfect Being; for we should render Him incapable of creating the things that are. Time and space must needs be regarded as characteristics pertaining to eternity and infinity. They are measurements mapped out therein. We shall have more to say on this subject in a little; but we satisfy ourselves here in finding that, as eventuality of necessity belongs to God, in the very processes of mind, as they are outwardly reflected, or found to exist in the works of creation, so time is of necessity a characteristic pertaining to the mind of God. And the Scriptures abundantly confirm this view. They not only speak of "the form of God," as indicating that the limitations of space belong to Him—limitations, by the way, that may be indefinitely extended, so as to cover the uttermost possible expanse, that is, expanse without limit; but they speak of the purposes, designs, or "decrees of God". If there are decrees of God, respecting one thing, and another thing, and another, then there

Digitized by Google

are thoughts of God, as distinguished from one another; and therefore there is time in God as the very necessity of His nature: time, however, that may be expanded from the smallest adminicle termed a twinkling, to the largest possible interval betwixt one eventuality and another—an interval that may be indefinitely expanded. What follows? If there is a succession of determinations in God, in symmetrical subordination, that is, a series of thoughts inwardly conceived, and of resolves separately formed, in order to their being outwardly realized, what alternative have we, but to apply to the highest Reason the experiences which we realize in ourselves? There is no other logical conclusion open to us: there is no other legitimate inference which we can draw. It is, moreover, quite out of the question, that contrary to all analogy and all reason, we should prescribe to God a category, whereby we place ourselves out of all sympathy with Him, and out of all possibility of understanding Him, or even of recognising the true and proper relation which belongs to us, as the offspring of God. The Scriptures reveal the mind of God to us, that we may acquire it, that we may follow after and imitate the same: "Be ye followers of God as dear children," and so be fitted to tabernacle with God. But how could this be if there were no succession, that is, no eventuality with God? If, therefore, we forestall our views of God, by laying down maxims as applicable to God, which lie wholly out of the range of human vision or apprehension, we do but constitute what is nothing less than a *reductio ad absurdum*, by reasoning therefrom.

Yet let me not be misunderstood. God hath revealed the future to us in the character of Dispensations; and

Digitized by Google

each dispensation may hang upon the other, even as one system of planets may be supposed to hang upon another; and as the parts of each system which go to make up the whole are intimately known to Him, even as the whole is known, so in the matter of eventuality which has to do with time, the intermediate arrangements which apply to the cycles of time must needs also be known to God, while yet in the immediate details of daily life, man is left to fulfil in freedom the desires of his heart. An "eternal now" may be taken, therefore, to mean a knowledge of the issues of each dispensation, while yet the succession of events which lead to these issues, are fairly before him. Absolute duration without movement would in a sense be an *eternal now*, but it would be eternal stillness: it would be duration without transition, duration without eventuality, duration without time—a duration without change—a duration without the consciousness of one thing as distinguished from the consciousness of another thing—a dead, unshifting duration of everlasting sameness; it would be everlasting sleep. This is the very opposite of the characteristic of God. There is in God not only a comprehension of the transitions that shall be within any limited sphere of arrangements, and, therefore, a comprehension of the general times embraced within these arrangements, but in the formation of the arrangements there is obvious transition from one step to another, in that He is said to have made the world in six days—days, during which one thing had to be laid for the basis of another; and all followed in subordinate dependence and preparation till man, the last of all His works, was brought upon the stage. It is only passing strange, therefore, that so many

Digitized by Google

are found pandering to the notion that there is no transition, and therefore no time, with God, a notion that runs counter to all that has been revealed, or can be known of God. It is said that in these circumstances we adopt an anthropological view of God. We do. What other view can we adopt? We are shut up to this view by every fair consideration which it is properly possible for us to entertain. This view touches not the question of what may be called "the form of God," of which precisely we can say nothing, and pretend nothing. That God must have form, if He has personality, is not to be disputed (and as to this we shall have occasion to say a few words); but what the precise form of God is, must be to us an idle question: what we know is, that *the great foundations of all knowledge* must be in God, and that out of these primary and eternal foundations, it is His province to devise new forms, that is, to manipulate new conceptions *ad infinitum* out of these, that is, to constitute fresh conditions of things, and to conjoin these as fresh causalities, under the best arrangements for the fulfilment of a purpose; and the processes of God's working is properly called *time.*

We must not then confound, as is too frequently done, what stands essentially separate in God, *viz.*, intelligence and will; for this has led to the wildest bewilderment and perplexity in discussing the decrees of God. It would seem sometimes as if the Intelligence of God were made altogether subordinate to the Will of God, in the Confession of Faith; for therein all is relegated simply and exclusively to will. "God (it is said) did from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own Will, freely and unchangeably

Digitized by Google

ordain whatsoever comes to pass"; and all that is said respecting divine knowledge, as connected with will, is as follows: "Although God knows whatever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions; yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future,[1] or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions" (c. 3., § 2). There is an utter ignoring, here, of the process whereby rational mind comes to the exercise of will. This is all-important; and the want of this consideration only confounds the whole subject of decrees more and more. We are here constrained simply to say: first, that there is no such thing, and there can properly be no such thing, as will, without knowledge; and second, that every exercise of will, without exception, arises from, and is dependent upon, knowledge. True it is, that so far as God is concerned, not a single object of creation could have come into being, but as ordered by the will of God, and precisely as it was ordered; but then the exercise of this very will behoved to be inevitably the outcome of the knowledge under which the will was formed. No rational mind ever determined, but under a knowledge of the

[1] How could aught be under any circumstances foreseen as future, apart from any causality to make it future; that is, how could anything arise as future if a causality were not constructed, out of which the phenomenon could come? And if such a causality were constructed, must not God have foreseen the circumstances and the propriety or necessity of such construction, and was not this motive enough for the fore-ordination? It cannot therefore be, that any case of fore-ordination could take place, but in dependence on an intelligence (*i.e.*, a fore-knowledge) of the circumstances under which the fore-ordination was made, as a resolve wise and good and righteous, under a perfect knowledge of the propriety and necessity of said resolve.

Digitized by Google

circumstantials under which the determination arose: apart from this, determination would be blind impulse; and we may not predicate this of God. We must needs, then, relegate fore-knowledge and fore-ordination into separate and distinct categories in the divine mind, otherwise we forestall the very difficulty we seek to unravel; and not only must we so separate them, but we must place knowledge as first, *in rerum naturâ*, preliminary to will. It will not suffice to speak of God "knowing what can come to pass under all supposed conditions"; there is a knowledge of God apart from this, and preliminary to this. God must know the possibility of the conditions, before the conditions themselves are determined. It is from this knowledge of *possibilities*, and from the knowledge that certain possibilities are wise, judicious, and righteous, that the will comes to determine that they shall become *certainties*. It is one thing to know aught as a possibility, having as yet no reality, either in the determination of the will, or in the prospect of the future as a thing ordained; and another thing to behold it as a certainty in the forthcoming arrangements which have actually been decreed and resolved on. The fore-knowledge which the Confession points to, arises from fore-ordination; whereas the fore-ordination itself arises from a different fore-knowledge, *viz.*, a fore-knowledge of possibilities.

And hereby may be cleared up a difficult avenue of thought on this great subject, by saying that in every rational mind, and consequently in God, as the highest reason, a fore-knowledge of *possibilities gives rise to fore-ordination*, when the possibilities are righteous and good; but that a fore-knowledge of *certainties takes its rise from their fore-ordination*. The Confession

Digitized by Google

fails to clear up the terrible incongruity it involves—by ignoring the former, and by classing all fore-knowledge as subordinate to fore-ordination. It is obvious, therefore, that much confusion has arisen, as betwixt what has been distinguished as Calvinistic and as Arminian thought, when neither the one nor the other properly expressed the true ideal. There must be knowledge in order to the formation of an intelligent will, and there is of course knowledge respecting a thing when once it is willed; but the *two kinds of knowledge* are quite distinct and separate. The knowledge that gives rise to will is what is spoken of in Scripture when Peter tells us that "election is *according* to fore-knowledge"; and also when Paul tells us, "Whom God did fore-know, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son"; but we have been utterly blinded to this view, by regarding all the fore-knowledge of God as of necessity confined to things ordained, that is, by regarding all the fore-knowledge of God as confined to the *certainties* of the future, and utterly ignoring that fundamental knowledge out of which all decree or determination comes.

Let it then be understood that there is an intelligence which opens up the path to the exercise of will, as well as an intelligence which sees, or looks upon, the things that are willed. The former supplies the motives from which will proceeds: the latter is an understanding of what will has already determined, and may form the basis of further decrees. Each process has its own causality; and the one is not to be confounded with the other.

This principle being once admitted, we obtain a key to the whole process and range of divine fore-ordination;

Digitized by Google

while, at the same time, we see what mischief has been inflicted on the Church, by narrowing the divine foreknowledge in the way which has been stated. In every case, then, in which the will of God has been pronounced, that is, in which the decrees of God have been framed, there must needs have been first of all a knowledge of the circumstances, as holy, righteous, and good, and therefore as motives for the exercise of will. In this way, we are not only able to pronounce on what may be termed the very springs of mental action, out of which the divine decree was pronounced; but we are able (and this too is all-important) to allocate each decree to its own proper place in the arrangements of divine determination; that is, we can connect it with its own proper motives.

Let us, for example, lay hold of the divine decree which resolved on the sending of the Lord Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of men. What could prompt God to do this? What, but a knowledge that man would need His interposition? What, therefore, but a pre-vision of the fall of man? This pre-vision constituted motive enough for God to see that His decrees in the creation of the world and of man should not be abortive, but should ultimately prove worthy of His wisdom and glory. Moreover, we have it intimated to us with sufficient clearness that to repair the ruin of the fall, Christ was sent into the world. We see, then, at once the place which this decree ought to occupy mentally, in the fore-arrangements of God. What more natural procedure—a procedure in every way consistent with Scripture-statement—than for God, on seeing the first Adam giving way to disobedience, to provide a second Adam as "the foundation" of life eternal, who should stand firm under all possible trials,

Digitized by Google

in the maintenance of the divine law, ordained for the guidance of man.

But it may fairly be asked, how should there be any Fall, and how should God have a fore-knowledge of the fall? It may be said that the fall, as an event in the future, must be either a contingency or a certainty (*i.e.*, an event of necessity): if a contingency, how could it be known as a certainty; and if a necessity, how can we escape making God the author of sin? If it stood in the future, simply as a possibility, it may be asked: Why should God provide against it, as a certainty? Would not His perfect wisdom be called in question for making an elaborate provision for what might never happen? Why should the Creator be working in uncertainty? We reply that the Creator does not work in uncertainty—that the fall of man must have been foreseen as a fact. How then, it will be asked, can we escape the conclusion that there must have been something defective in the work of God, in failing to fulfil its great end? We are persuaded there was nothing at all defective in the mechanism of man, when placed in Eden by God; we are persuaded that the wisdom of God, and the power of God, did all which it was possible to do, in the circumstances, to make man perfect; it being understood that God, in prescribing laws to His creature, must permit these to operate as the laws of human nature, without any interposition on God's part to aid them, *i.e.*, to bolster them up specifically as laws. We suspect it must come out, that, while man was made in the *best possible frame and constitution*, which a perfect Creator could adopt, in connection with the peculiar composition and characteristics of his nature, as the creature of a *two-fold law* (the law of his bodily

Digitized by Google

frame, with its necessary impulses in common with what belongs to the animal economy generally; and the law of a high morality, as the controlling and regulative power, supported, in its restraining influences, by the authoritative dicta of God Himself), it was essential for him to be preliminarily tried as to its strength and power for the fulfilling of the divine behests; and it was known that, under the severity of this trial, man would yield obedience to the lower law rather than to the higher. It is perfectly easy to conceive that, in the circumstances, there was no alternative for God, but to create man as he was actually created—that man, so created, had to be developed into a condition of immortality—that in order to this development, man had of necessity to deny himself to the lower nature, in order that he might become altogether a creature of the higher nature—that in order to this, a discipline must needs be introduced, a discipline which demanded that the lower nature must give way to the higher—that it behoved that a very clear and practical exemplification of this should be manifested under a special trial, whereby the devil was permitted to do his utmost—that it was foreseen that the devil, by cunning and falsehood, would succeed in betraying man into sin—that it was essential to undo the work of the devil—that this could be done in one way only, *viz.*, by providing and ordaining a Saviour Who should be able to meet the devil on his own terms, One Who should counteract the evil done by the devil, and Who should apply the restoratives of His provision for the recovery of man, that is, for the recovery of those who should form the elect of God to be given to Christ for this end.

We can see, then, that while there was no way of crea-

Digitized by Google

ting man better than he was created, there was no alternative but to permit the fall of man. It would come to this, therefore, that the fall must be allowed to take place, or God must cease from creating man; and if God ceased from creating man, the argument must be, why should God create at all? Surely it will be admitted, that if, in the divine economy, God saw (or foresaw) how He could meet and counteract the evils introduced by the fall, it was infinitely more to His honour and glory to permit the fall, and to accomplish through the fall the grand purposes in which creation must result, than to stop short, under the self-confession which thus would have been proclaimed, that immortality in the case of man could not be achieved at all.

Having then got over the question of the fall, on principles which ought to satisfy all the demands of human reason; and having satisfied ourselves as to the divine provision for a foundation for the salvation of man, we are at liberty to take up the question of Predestination with respect to man himself. And here we meet with incongruities, as the problem is presented to us, and we are able to get over two great difficulties: one as to the place which the predestination of *man* ought to occupy amid the decrees of God; and the other as to the charge of caprice on the part of God, as thinking it needful to institute any predestination at all; as if God were not an impartial Being, if He elected some to everlasting life, and reprobated some to everlasting death.

As to the former of these difficulties, we have seen that without respect of persons, and before any ordination had been determined on with respect to individual man, a foundation had first to be laid; and that

Digitized by Google

on the fore-knowledge of the fall, the fore-ordination of Jesus Christ, as fairly and fully meeting that evil, had been arranged and fixed. This gives Christ that true place in the economy of God, as "the foundation" on which the superstructure of human salvation had to be laid; and in thus laying such a foundation, it takes away the hundred and one perplexities into which the Church has been thrown in solving the problem—"for whom did Christ die?" while it naturally coincides with Scripture-statement as to the fact, that the elect among men "are *given to Christ*" to be redeemed from sin and from wrath. How could they be "given to Christ" if there were no Christ already fore-ordained? They are said to be "chosen in Christ"; but how could this be, if there were not already provided a Christ *in Whom* they might be planted? But what is the arrangement which the Confession seems to espouse? It says, "As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto"; that is, the purpose of election, as regards *man*, having been fixed, He then framed the means whereby it was to be accomplished, in which case the fore-ordination of Christ is postponed to meet the fore-ordination of man. The incongruity which exists here is, in regarding Christ as "the means to fulfil an end," instead of regarding Christ as the ground on which alone the end can be accomplished. The *means* whereby the end is to be accomplished is the calling of God; but the calling of God cannot be introduced until there is, in the first place, a foundation laid; and, in the second place, until objects, to choose amongst, are found, on whom to operate; these are the means ordained for accomplishing the predestination of

Digitized by Google

God. It is obvious, then, that the predestination of man is subsequent to, and dependent on, the predestination of Christ. This is an all-important consideration.

As to the latter of the difficulties mentioned, *viz.*, why an absolutely impartial Being should make any selection at all beforehand as to their final state, and dispose of them accordingly, this too has been regarded as a question that must needs lie wholly beyond our analysis; and no wonder, when we consider the conditions by which said predestination is fettered; for it is simply relegated to the Supreme will, as an initiatory determination, without regard to the motives which must needs operate in God, in the framing of His will. We do not see, however, why this question of the predestination of man should not be brought completely within the category of human reason to understand it and expound it, while we have the Scriptures in our hands. We have spoken of the means adopted whereby men are given to Christ; and as the very foundation of carrying these means into effect, we find that first and foremost there must be an *arrestment of man in sin* before there can be a *pursuit by man after righteousness*—that there must be a conviction of sin and of the danger attending a persistency in sin, before there can be the hatred and forsaking of sin, with a turning to God. Let us keep in view this, as an indispensable process in the human mind, as regards the recovery of man from a state of sin and of misery to a state of salvation; and what do we find? We find, in the first place, what we would anticipate, *viz.*, absolute impartiality on the part of God; for *His very first call* is entirely general, without respect of persons, and without

Digitized by Google

the element of election or of reprobation, in that "He calleth on *all men everywhere* to repent". This fact has not been sufficiently noted; for, had it been so, it would have gone far to justify the ways of God to man. It is in virtue of this general call that some men are brought to repentance; that is, that they are arrested in sin, as being convinced of its heinousness and danger. But repentance does not constitute the recovery of man, and does not constitute the salvation of man. What then? God, having from the beginning instituted a principle of election, as that on which alone salvation could possibly rest—election on essential data, that is, on the sole principle on which it must be righteously carried out, *selects or elects such as are arrested, that they may become believers in Jesus Christ.* All is the work of God: *God first says to one and to all* to whom He comes, "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, why will ye die?" Some, alarmed by the threat of death, cry out, "What must I do to be saved?" *i.e.*, "How am I to escape this threatened death?" As the fact of an arrestment in a career of sin will not suffice for salvation, God therefore answers, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved". Such then as are brought thus to conviction of sin and sorrow for sin are *specially elected* to apply to Jesus Christ for the grace that bringeth salvation. It is obvious, then, that *the general call on the part of an all-gracious God, must needs prepare the way for the special or particular call.* If there were none arrested in sin by the general call, why of course there could be none on whom the particular call could alight; for "the natural man (*i.e.*, the man who has not been arrested in his sin) receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, neither can he know

Digitized by Google

them, because they are spiritually discerned"; and there can be no spiritual discernment where the mind is directed exclusively by carnal and worldly impulses? These impulses having been once disturbed and broken, scope is afforded for seeing what it is that endangers the soul, and what it is that saves the soul, when the righteousness of Christ is offered. It is through this general call, then, that the particular or electing or effectual call comes; in plain terms, it is through the interruption of the sinful life, under what is called "godly sorrow," that God chooses men to become righteous, in order that they may have godly joy, while, of course, it is incumbent on God to reject or reprobate those who have refused at His call to give up their sin.

Such are the principles upon which we hold that the election of God rests—principles so consistent in reason, and so harmonious with Scripture, as to appear to us incontrovertible and solid; nor can we see how they can be spoken against. It is said that such principles lead to the doctrine of merit in the creature, as having or holding an ability to work out his own salvation. The very reverse of this is the case. In every possible step that man makes, it can be pointed out that God has been before him, and been with him; and that he has been the subject of the grace of God. If the Calvinistic theology cannot have its side-issues carried out, neither can the Arminian theology have all its conclusions supported. We do not believe in any natural grace of congruity, by which a man may, as it were, meet God half-way. It is God alone that comes first to break down the law of sin, and it is God alone that comes to bestow the law of righteousness. Man, if he were left

Digitized by Google

to himself, would of necessity, as a fallen creature, forfeit eternal life, as being without the Spirit; and as being under the carnal heart, which is enmity against God; but God interposes in a fallen world, and His arrows lodge in the hearts of some, while they rebound from those of others; and wherever the arrow really enters, there sin is wounded; and then He makes the special call inviting to come and receive the Gospel of salvation; and the things of Christ are freely given, and given with the most powerful motives on men to receive them, so that it may well be said that "God is the Author and Finisher of our faith". In all this election too, it ought to be observed, that there is already provided a glorious and sure foundation on which to rest. In this way, then, we get rid of the incongruities wherewith we are surrounded by the ordinary and more popular views: we bring the great difficulties of Scripture within the range of scientific truths; and we set forth all, as comporting with the wisdom and goodness of God, as revealed in Scripture.[1]

There is again the great doctrine of Atonement, in regard to which so many incongruities are found, and in regard to which so many in the Church of God are ill at ease. Some of these have of necessity been pointed to, in the remarks already made respecting justification. It is acknowledged on all hands that enormous difficulties adhere to this absorbing question, on the ordinary supposition of substitution; and that substitution can never be harmonized with scientific theology. So much is this the case, that it is believed that the dogma of substitution could not have maintained its place, but for the

[1] See *Excursus I.* "On the Divine Decrees".

Digitized by Google

alternative of dismissing the idea, and consequently the reality, of atonement from the creed of the Church. It has been found that this alternative could not be consistently adopted, with a frank submission to the teaching of Holy Scripture. The Churches have felt that the doctrine of atonement *must* on Scripture principles be rigidly adhered to, and that its duty is to wait for such light as may be thrown upon it in the course of time, without compromising any other well-sustained truth, as revealed by the Scriptures, and accepted as conformable to enlightened reason. If we are to have a scientific theology, as applicable to atonement, then its principles must square with the principles of causality. We have seen that on these principles, a purely objective fact can never be made to account for a purely subjective phenomenon—that there must be the *application* of the objective fact to the object on which the change is effected, before there can by possibility be a causal operation; that is, there must have been constituted what in philosophy has been called "the causal nexus," in order to the production of the reconciliation which atonement is properly said to effect, and in point of fact does effect.

Here, however, it is, that our creeds are inconsistent with themselves. On the one hand, they will have Christ to be the substitute, Who has entirely satisfied God for the elect, that is, Who has as a proxy done in their behalf, what the law expressly requires of themselves: on the other hand, they hold that the substitution does not hold good till there has been the exercise of faith in Jesus Christ—that faith through which the things of Christ are applied to them.

The deeper problem, however, must be first solved—

Digitized by Google

How or in what way was it possible for Christ to make any atonement whatever? We must have very clear and consistent views as to *what constitutes atonement;* and then we must see that Jesus Christ was in the very situation which made it possible for *Him* to render atonement. That which demanded atonement was sin —sin as the thing offensive to God—sin as the thing which had to be taken away, and which it was, and is, impossible for God to embrace. The foundation of atonement, then, lay in *the taking away of sin from the person.* But the mere taking away of sin would leave the soul in a negative state; in order, therefore, to the completion of atonement, there must be *a replenishment of the soul with righteousness.* This latter constitutes man to be positively what God demands, in order that he may be qualified for heaven. If such be a sound definition of atonement, viz., *the abolishment of sin from the soul, and the inbringing of righteousness into the soul,* the question then comes to be—*How could Christ Jesus make any atonement unto God?*

The difficulty is apparent. How could He take away sin, if absolutely He had no sin? This point has formed a *crux* in the Church; and it is thought to be got over by saying that sin was imputed to Christ, while yet He had no sin. This assuredly is not satisfactory. How, in the name of righteousness, could sin be ascribed to Christ, while there was literally and truly no ground for ascribing it? Can there in truth be imputation, where there is no impartation? This complexion of the case has staggered not a few; while, moreover, the farther difficulty arises; —Were there no sin attachable to the person of Christ, there was no sin to be removed; and if there was no

Digitized by Google

sin removed, how could atonement be made? In what way could the battering and bruising of the sinless One take away sin? No satisfactory answer can be given to this question: how, then, are we, consistently and honourably for ourselves and for our God, to get out of the difficulty? The Scriptures say that Christ was "without sin": yes! and the Scriptures say He was "made sin". Can these two statements be perfectly reconciled? It is believed they can: not indeed in the sense that we can affirm and deny simultaneously of the self-same thing. That cannot be. In what sense, then, was Christ "made sin"? We answer in the words of Paul:—that He was *sent in the same human flesh with ourselves*—in that flesh which Paul tells us, is the foundation of human sin. This fact alone explains to us the *necessity* of the incarnation; and assuredly the incarnation had its share in constituting the personality of Jesus. The other question must, in like manner, be answered. In what sense was Christ "without sin"? We answer in the words of John:—that "*in Him is no sin*". What then? Christ Jesus bore about with Him our body of sin, that body which had "enmity in His flesh," (Eph. ii. 15); and He bore in His soul through this fact, the assaults of sin, so that He was "tempted in all points like as we are"; but still inwardly He was "without sin". The human soul, which in our case is contaminated by the lusts of the flesh, was in His case undefiled, in as far as He was replenished by a resisting or antagonistic Power, whereby He was inwardly kept absolutely pure and holy.

By this consideration, we obtain a full and satisfactory explanation of the seemingly contradictory terms applied to Christ. The Apostle tells us that "with the flesh we

Digitized by Google

serve the law of sin," and "they that are in the flesh cannot please God," in which case, however, the flesh has dominion in *our* souls, as receptive of, and obedient to, the carnal impulse. But Christ was distinguished from mere man in this respect, that while He had the burden of the body of our flesh, and the assaults which emanate from the body of the flesh, He was not submissive thereto, but repelled them all; and not only this, but He made it a point in His career to sacrifice these, till there was none of them; and finally He offered up the whole body to that death, which dissipated all assaults of sin whatever, or the possibility of any assaults in the future. Truly, then, Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and stood spotless before God; and this He could do, and did, through the power of the Eternal Spirit, with which He was endowed.

Here was a valid and substantial atonement; hereby was the removal of the offence which characterized humanity; and this, in the person of the Lord Jesus; here was the reversal of the very evil which was introduced by the fall; hereby was full and entire satisfaction made to the divine law, which had been outraged in the person of ordinary man; here, then, was a representation of that atonement whereby sin in its very foundations was removed from the person; and righteousness, in its intrinsic purity, became the characteristic of the soul. Thus was the perfected manhood introduced by Christ, which constitutes the foundation and the pattern of that new man, which in our case, alone qualifies for Heaven, at the same time, that it gives the title to Heaven—rendering the grand doctrine of imputation in *all* respects founded on the strict and sober reality of impartation.

We are now in circumstances to maintain and defend

Digitized by Google

the great doctrines of the Reformation, on principles better than the abettors of the Reformation contended for, or were able in their circumstances so to do. That there should be a modification of their views, as handed down to us, is absolutely inevitable; but the modification does not touch the fact of the doctrines, as incontestible Scripture-truths—truths confirmed by the application of a scientific process, in virtue of which, cause and effect are manifested in the same alembic; and in virtue of which, the incongruities which apply to Reformation-principles in their present creed-complexion are removed. With these modifications, the advocates of the Reformation ought not only to be confirmed and strengthened in the fundamental maxim, that the Bible is the profoundly divine revealer of Heavenly truth, but the sceptic ought himself to be satisfied that he has no secure footing as an antagonist of Scripture.

Our position is this: First of all, we rely on it that we have substantial evidence that the Scriptures must be from God; and this we have under the *external* testimonies which are born in their favour, as a revelation from God; and thus we are brought to the study of them with the preliminary assurance that the doctrines contained in them must be true; and as true, that they must be capable of bearing any righteous examination of their claims to acceptance. The Scriptures have injustice done to them by two parties: by believers, and by unbelievers; by believers, when the Scriptures are made to conform their teaching to preconceived views, which are not themselves well-founded; and by unbelievers, when the Scriptures are repudiated as inconsistent with certain rationalistic sentiments

Digitized by Google

which are made the standard of their admeasurement. What we desiderate for the Scriptures is "no fear, no favour": no fear, if they be God's word, because He is able to defend that which He has Himself spoken; and no favour for the self-same reason. False props are simply mischievous.

Assuredly, in these circumstances, a solemn question arises for the Churches, that each should search into its foundations, to see whether the body of Christ, as branched off in each case, is in perfect harmony with that sketched in the person of Christ, as the standard of beauty. We are told that Christ "broke down the middle wall of partition, having abolished the enmity in His flesh, as the law of its commandments, by its decrees: *that He might create the two that were in Himself into one new man;* so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body to God, by means of the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. ii. 14-16). Has not the same process to be gone through by the body of Christ now upon the earth? The Church Catholic, as the body of Christ, has received the fulness of the Spirit; and it becometh her to yield to the teachings of the Spirit, at whatever cost to herself. In so doing, she must make many sacrifices. She must sacrifice the dogmas which have unwarrantably characterized her, so soon as these have been found not to be in perfect accordance with the divine word; and she must sacrifice earthly privileges, which have heretofore sustained and supported her, so soon as these are found to be a clog to her spiritual growth: and she must stand aloof from the contamination of the world, so soon as she finds her progress impeded thereby. These are "the after-sufferings," which apply to the

Digitized by Google

body of Christ (Col. i. 24) as now enduring the cross in the world. We mistake when our minds are occupied as to the formation of alliances betwixt Presbytery and Episcopacy. These are comparatively superficial distinctions; and were such an alliance effected to-morrow, there would still be the deeper momenta, touching the fundamentals of the Church. What is wanted is, first of all, to see as to purity and fulness of doctrine; and, therefore, whether we may not advantageously give up something, and at the same time advantageously acquire something; whether, therefore, some glaring inconsistencies might not be judiciously expunged from our creed-system, by having it re-arranged; and whether, therefore, an enlarged agreement of the Churches might not be effected on the great Reformation principle of making the Scriptures the exclusive rule of faith and manners.

But probably before a consummation of this sort can be effected, or before it can be even attempted with any hope of success, we must probe even more deeply into the arcana on which the Scriptures themselves do rest. The Scriptures rest on this, that "there is one God and Father of all, of Whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him". This foundation, it seems, is not enough for some scientists of the present day. It is even desiderated whether there be a personal God at all, and we are called to the proof whether a universal Pantheism does not lie at the foundations of a worldly economy; and whether a *natura naturans* does not sufficiently account for a *natura naturata*. We are thus put upon our metal to defend the very foundations of our belief in the person of God Himself, while our attention is drawn

Digitized by Google

to account for the forces of nature, as apart from the express intervention of God, as a Personality over the kingdom of nature. It is the province of science to inquire into the forces of nature; but whether science has yet reached satisfactory conclusions as to the *rationale* of these forces, may well be questioned; for scientists are still fighting over the subject. We may be permitted for the moment to take the side of those who hold a pantheistic view of the universe; and disregarding or rather overlooking the question (all-important, by the way) as to how the facts of creation originated, contemplate how the facts of creation have their play in the world.

It is impossible, in a *résumé* of this sort, to go into this profound question; but there are certain great phenomena which assure us of the existence of a universal medium, to which the name of Ether has been assigned — a medium much more refined than the minutest consistency of matter known — a medium which conveys the light of the sun, and at the same time the heat of the sun, in order that these may come in contact with our world—a medium, moreover, which accounts for the operation of gravitation, and which has been laid hold of, also, to account for the operations of magnetism and electricity—a medium, by means of which the pictures of objects are conveyed to our vision —a medium, therefore, which, unlike to matter so-called, seems illimitable in its capacity of simultaneous convection, as applicable to every condition of material objects.

What is this universal medium called Ether, which seems not only to pervade all space but even to penetrate all matter? It is a medium of which this can

Digitized by Google

be predicated, that, unlike to matter, which expresses the special conditions of some *special quality*, that is, quality conditioned by limitation, it possesses in itself *the generic attribute of all special qualities*, with the dynamic attribute, also, of inherent energy or potentiality. We say this, because it is demonstrable that this medium has the property of representing objects universally; and in less vividness as the square of the distance increases. It not only operates in one, and the same *locale*, as terrestrial gravitation, and terrestrial magnetism, and terrestrial illumination, and terrestrial warmth; but it operates with inexhaustible potentiality in disseminating in light a representation of objects all around, so that the reflection of them may be pictured upon the eye, or upon a thousand eyes, as the case may be, while at the same time, also, its dynamical energy is shown, in manifesting the properties of any special magnet, or of any electrical current, or of any chemical affinity. What can we say of this all-pervading Ether? It is obvious that we must needs ascribe to it the wonderful property of doing a thousand things in one and the same place, at one and the same time. And what it does is this: It conveys the properties of matter dynamically, so that our various senses receiving, by means of the Ether the conditions of these, we become acquainted with them; and that it conveys these with the utmost minuteness, we know, when we behold our face reflected in a mirror, or receive the reflection fixed on a photographic plate. What is an ordinary magnet but the peculiar polarization of a steel bar, but this in Ether manifests the same dynamically, where there is an affinity (of iron filings, *e.g.*) with the metal. What is electricity but the current induced, say, in an iron wire, by the action

Digitized by Google

which is generated in a galvanic battery: this current can be made to convey not only special *forms*, but special *qualities*, as is proved in the case of the telephone.

What, then, are scientific men forced to conclude? Why this; *that one and same medium is the servitor or bearer of all the forces which prevail in nature.* We think this to be more than likely; and that the growth of plants, and every manifestation of energy in the world, has its foundation herein, and is accounted for hereby. That Ether has an affinity for all matter, in that it gives dynamical representation to all matter, is obvious enough. Is it an extraordinary leap to a conclusion, then, if we suppose this ethereal medium to be the mother-element, out of which all matter is originally formed. What is matter, but *some definite quality of substance under limitation:* matter is limitation in respect of qualities; here is a medium whose attribute is non-limitation, having the prerogative of sympathizing with, and expressing, all the limitations of matter, as far as these are present. What then must we regard this universal Ether to be? We can regard it as nothing else than spirit essentially; and here we are able to obtain *a definition of spirit*, in that we are made to apprehend the wonderful attributes of this same medium, at least in connection with matter. Spirit, as applicable to the economy of the material world, is that universal substance which, having the attribute of inherent energy, and of generic quality, as the fountain of all special qualities, constitutes the medium in which all material things here do live, and move, and subsist—in which, moreover, the laws of nature do operate. The conclusion here would naturally be that we land ourselves at once in the sea of Pantheism. If this be

Digitized by Google

pantheism, we have no objections; but we have another stage to make in our progress.

It will be observed that, as regards the ethereal medium, we have as yet discovered spirit in its *objective* aspect only—an aspect, in which, throughout the whole range of the material economy, there is no manifestation of consciousness. That there is spirit under a *subjective* aspect cannot admit of a moment's doubt, in the fact of our own personal consciousness. It is utterly impossible to run up the objective and subjective into a primitive oneness, where these distinctions are obliterated. They must be eternally distinct, and therefore be kept absolutely distinguished; and they must be equally all-pervading; the objective side as giving expression to all matter, the subjective side as the basis of expressing all mind; the objective side being the ground in which all matter functions, and subjective side in which all mind functions. We say that the source and fountain of *mind* lies in the subjective department of spirit; and this comes, and can possibly come, into manifestation, only where scope is afforded for its display, that is, according to the organization, and in precise conformity to the organization, with which the creature is built up and endowed. What we say, then, of *spirit in its completeness*, is, that one dynamical energy pervades the whole (subjective and objective); but that there are two distinctive qualitative characteristics, *viz.*, one of the objective as the basis of all matter, and the other of the subjective as the basis of all mind; and that, while the former operates *per se* in connection with all matter, the latter operates only through the former, when, according to the kind of organization, scope or opportunity is afforded for the manifestation of the subjective.

Digitized by Google

I cannot here go into the particulars which illustrate what has now been said; but I am content, in the first place, to obtain assurance of the existence of a universal Spirit, all-pervading, in which all matter and all mind do function according to the laws of their being. Were we to stop short however here, we should have pure pantheism and nothing else; but we may not, we cannot stop here. What do we find? We find, as the universal characteristic of spirit, the wonderful prerogative of manifoldness in expressing conditions simultaneously. Its ability to express the *formation of all defined conditions*, is such, that it has always an openness, or if you choose, emptiness, indefinitely to express still more conditions, when presented. By conditions I mean *express qualitative forms* to which we give the name of individuality. What follows? Why, clearly this, that there is nothing in the world to hinder the supposition, in the first place, that, under this one primitive substance, there *may be* therein a primordial Fountain of all conditions; while the very fact that we find therein the conditions of subsisting nature, *compels* us to believe that this *must be* the case, in order to obtain a Cause for them.

One thing is obvious to us, that conditions cannot come into being, but as the offspring of conditions previously existing. Were there nothing in beinghood primordially, but universal substance without any distinctions in modality, it is perfectly obvious that there could be no beginning of modality. Existence, in that case, would be one uniform rest in sleep: it would be duration only, *i.e.*, eternity without the element of *time:* it would be extension only, *i.e.*, infinity without the element of *space.* Were there no conditions, there-

Digitized by Google

fore, in primordial beinghood, that is, in primary substance, it is obvious that there could be no conditions introduced as indispensable to constitute created or secondary substance.

But we find, as a simple fact, that conditions are everywhere present as inevitable for matter; that it is made up of conditions limited in their very nature; it follows, then, and follows as a necessary consequence, that there must have been Conditions *ab initio*—conditions fundamentally and primordially in union—conditions uncreated and unproduced, as the source and fountain of conditions of a temporary or evanescent nature; while all conditions, whether eternal or temporary, must stand, and can only stand, as qualities inhering in the One, as the attribute of His substance. There can be no quality apart from the substance of which it is the quality; and condition is but a particular of quality. What then? Why, here, surely we are compelled to draw the inference, either that the atoms, which lie at the foundation of matter, are eternal and uncreated; or that there must have been some Personality at the foundation in virtue of whose operation they were constructed, and each with its own peculiar property or properties.

The view very much taken at the present is, that atoms are eternal, and indestructible—that, however much ordinary matter may be destroyed as the condition of things in the world, the atoms, of which all matter is composed, do by this kind of destruction, go back merely to their original integrity, and have the capacity of entering anew into fresh and wholly different forms from those which they formerly composed. We have very great difficulty in believing that the

Digitized by Google

atoms of matter were not originally created; for we are led by this dogma into a series of dilemmas. One dilemma is, that we are brought in that case to conclude, that primordially, there were more kinds of independent substance than one—a conclusion which we cannot receive, in as far as we have satisfactory reason for believing, that there is beyond all else a substance known as spirit, which is essentially non-atomic, penetrating all, and supporting all. Another dilemma is, that, if atoms are eternal and uncreated, no good reason can be assigned for their separate qualities and characteristics, in virtue of which they have their definite laws of combination, which qualities and characteristics indicate most unambiguously the nature of a purpose; and a purpose can only be in mind. A third dilemma is as to the constitution of this our material world. If atoms are eternal, how came they to enter into the combinations which everywhere, and at all points, show such wonderful wisdom in the amazingly complex adaptations of all nature; and further, when or how did these adaptations begin? A fourth dilemma is that, if atoms are eternal and indestructible, the world either had no beginning, or that eternity is somehow an unbeginning cycle of changes. Can we receive these difficulties? Can we abide in these dilemmas? Can we get rid of the conclusion that there is a purposing Mind at the foundation, as the only rational method of accounting for the things that are? Let us grant that atoms are eternal and uncreated: what follows? Why this, that there is no substance besides and beyond matter, and therefore that God Himself (unless we are to disbelieve in such a being), is composed of matter, and therefore divisible and destructible; or that

Digitized by Google

He is some one or other of the atoms, and therefore that the rest are independent of Him, or that the atoms are themselves Gods!

But have we any absolutely sufficient evidence that atoms are indestructible? We have not seen any irrefragable argument supporting this view. True, it is said that this dogma has been spoken of as "another grand scientific generalization of the nineteenth century"; and as such, it is said to "deal a final death-blow to the ancient notion of creation". And what is the argument for the indestructibility of atoms? Physicists reply that "it has been proved that for every apparent loss of some form of matter, there has been its relative equivalent in some other form".[1] We must be permitted to

[1] "Matter is immortal and indestructible (says Büchner). There is not an atom in the universe that can be lost. We cannot, even in thought, remove or even add an atom without admitting that the world would thereby be disturbed, and the laws of gravitation, and the equilibrium of matter interfered with. It is the great merit of modern chemistry to have proved in the most convincing manner that the uninterrupted change of matter which we daily witness, the origin and decay of organic and inorganic forms and tissues, do not arise, as was hitherto believed, from new materials, but that this change consists in nothing else than the constant and continuous metamorphosis of the same elementary principles, the quantity and the quality of which ever is, and ever remains the same. Matter has, by means of the scales, been followed in all its various and complicated transitions, and everywhere it has been found to emerge from any combination in the same quantity as it has entered. We burn a piece of wood, and at first sight it appears as if its constituents had been consumed in fire and smoke. The balance of the chemist, on the other hand, teaches us that not only has nothing been lost of the wood in weight, but on the contrary, the weight has been *increased*" [Force and Matter, p. 5]. The language employed here is strong and unhesitating, but to me it is not convincing. The illustration supplied from burning a piece of wood is far from settling the point in ques-

Digitized by Google

doubt this statement. There are many cases of combustion in which it is utterly impossible to shew that in the destruction of the matter of the world, there is not, at the same time, an absolute destruction of the very atoms of which the subject was composed. That the matter of which a subject is composed undergoes

tion: first, because the exact weight of the burned refuse is not returned, but is increased; and second, because it wants the demonstration of re-forming the wood out of the atoms displaced by burning. There are many contingencies which might be regarded as sufficient to preserve atoms in the present sphere of being, while, after all, it would be illogical and unwarrantable to pronounce them to be absolutely indestructible. But what we aver is, that so little are we conversant with the precise connection of atoms with the primordial Ether, which we regard as non-atomic, and as having absolute continuity, it yet adapts itself so naturally to the atomic condition of matter, that it seems to us quite premature to predicate the indestructibility of atoms. "The fond idea (says Picton) that the substance of the world may be tracked to its indestructible elements in atomic points of matter, has been shewn, by the contradictions in which it lands us, to be an enthusiastic delusion of minds intoxicated by the rapidity with which, vista beyond vista is opened through the phenomenal world by the talisman of science." In another place, the same author says:—"If the atomic theory is true, in the sense that matter ultimately consists of indivisible, incompressible, indestructible, unchangeable particles, which not only have no further interpretation, but need none; then materialistic atheism is inevitable, and this great world, which seems like a grand beautiful creation, instinct with unalterable life, is dead and ice cold at the heart. There is no avoiding this conclusion; for the theory would make the elementary atoms of matter to be true substance, in the sense that they are the ultimate reality, underlying the appearances which make up our experience. For if the ultimate atoms are real substance, it follows that they are the only substance in the universe; and God, if there be a God, is like ourselves, a concourse of molecules, with attributes resulting solely from their action and re-action" [The Mystery of Matter, p. 74].

Digitized by Google

changes in the chemical transformations of which it is susceptible, cannot be disputed—that a drop of water is formed by the union of its constituents, oxygen and hydrogen; and again, that atoms of oxygen and hydrogen enter into other formations, as when the former unites with nitrogen to make atmospheric air, and the latter unites with nitrogen to form ammonia, are doctrines sufficiently demonstrated: that what are called the primary elements do in their atomic or primitive structure enter into certain determinate combinations to constitute the varied material of our ordinary experience, is at once admitted; but what does this prove? Why, this, that there is an a, b, c, as the fundamental elements of creation, even as there is an a, b, c, as the fundamental elements of which any literary production is composed. The type which the printer has set up to construct his page to-day, may be distributed to-morrow, returned to the various boxes, and again employed in displaying a very different subject-matter. No one questions this; but this does not prove that the type may not itself be susceptible of destruction. We know that as type can be formed *ab initio*, so it can be destroyed. The potent liquid called ink, forms, in the author's hands, the source from which he supplies innumerable letters of the alphabet, in due order, to express his meaning, and these letters, so conjoined, are as easily destroyed as they are easily constructed.

Analogy, therefore, will not assist us to the doctrine of the indestructibility of atoms. If there be a primordial mother substance (as we believe there is) from which atoms have been derived, and their separate characteristics constructed, we are only reduced to the conclusion

Digitized by Google

which the analogy of nature teaches, that as atoms become destroyed there is always an inexhaustible source from which they can be supplied, according as circumstances may demand. We find, as a simple fact, that the face is reflected in a mirror,—that the image is engraven on the photographic plate—that there is an expression of polarization outside of, but under the influence of, what may be termed the magnetic action of the subject, an action that is seen to operate in the plastic substance of the sap for example, when a new layer of wood is formed on the tree. It would seem to follow, then, that lines of force are to be found in connection with every material subject whatever, and that these have their expression in the universal Ether, by which all space is pervaded. Sir David Brewster believed that Ether itself must be regarded as "a compound body consisting of, and containing all the elements of, matter". Sir John Herschell in his treatise on Light, acknowledged to be one of the most masterly productions, speaks of Ether as "an elastic medium of extreme tenuity filling all space, and penetrating all bodies, but *in their interior to exist in a different state of density and elasticity from those which belong to it in a disengaged state*". These statements are made, not simply to indicate that there is a universal medium called Ether, of which all are now-a-days convinced; and not simply to indicate that there is a direct sympathy between Ether and matter, of which there are endless proofs; but to indicate that, while Ether is obviously an antecedent element to atoms, it *does itself undergo a modification in the presence of matter;* and if so, Is it any great stride to say, that (regarding it as the generic stock from which all matter is produced) it

Digitized by Google

hereby proves a power whereby atoms are extemporized according to the necessities of any growing, or healing, or repairing relationship?

Moreover, if we are to say that atoms are indestructible, what becomes of the doctrine which seems to be sufficiently settled and confirmed that the characteristics of atoms are essentially modified by temperature? What about expansion and contraction under the application of heat and cold? What about the varied condition of atoms in the case of the self-same substance existing as a solid, as a liquid, and as a gas? If, then, unquestionably the condition of atoms is *alterable*, is there any valid objection that can be stated as to their being destructible? We cannot get rid of the conclusion that, if what may be called the intrinsic life, which constitutes the essential character of atoms, may be changed, that the life, that is the character, that is the power, which pertains to the atom, may be taken away altogether. Besides, if the atom is to be regarded as indestructible, then we have no help but to regard it as the ultimate reality of substance; and if so, then we are shut up to regard this great world, so instinct with varied life, as centrally dead and cheerless; we are in fact shut up to materialistic atheism!

Nor is the dogma that atoms are divisible *ad infinitum* to be received. It shocks our common sense to say that what is by its very existence set forth as *limitation* should yet be regarded as intrinsically *non-limitation* — that because we can go on increasing in size indefinitely, so we can go on decreasing in size indefinitely. It might well be asked, in these circumstances, where should there be a beginning? There must be a boundary line betwixt atomic structure and non-atomic continuity; and all we

Digitized by Google

can say is that, while there must be a point at which the element of materialism begins, as contrasted with the spirit-element, which is an indivisible *plenum*, so there must needs be a terminus, at which the extension of the matter-element terminates, because we cannot conceive any amount of limitation to fill up that which cannot be filled up—*viz.*, infinity. Besides, were it possible that atoms could be continuously divided, it would utterly confound molecular mechanics, because it would destroy what are regarded as the ultimate centres of elementary forces.

How, then, do we escape the incongruities which have been attached to atoms, as regarded to be eternal and indestructible, or to be susceptible of division without end? We have not to frame the hypothesis of an absolute Ether, for that is abundantly proved; but avoiding the absurdity of two eternal and independent substances, we naturally seize on that to which no limit can be assigned, and we are shut up to the conclusion that the one is the parent-ground from which the other is produced. And if this should be called a hypothesis, it is a hypothesis which is supported by every phenomenon in Nature. If we assign to this Ether, as embosoming in generic state, all possible qualities fundamentally, without any one of them being discovered in particular, somewhat as daylight contains the foundations of most if not all colours, itself being colourless; and if we assign to Ether, also, the attribute of inherent energy as a constant, we seem to have all that is required to explain what is matter, and how it happens that all matter must be attended with a force, which is the exponent of its quality, and how it comes to pass that there is, and

Digitized by Google

must be, a necessary correlation of all forces, one with another according to the conditions of matter, that is, according to the changes which are manifested in the material ingredients in which the forces are manifested. We gather a maxim, then, of enormous value, in as far as it is a maxim of universal application, that *it is particular quality in substance that initiates a force*, and that *according to the conditions in which separate qualities of matter are brought into combination, so will the special characteristics of force be manifested.*

It is at this point that we are brought face to face with the question—How came qualities to be particularised? And therefore, how came force to be initiated? It is obvious that if no power exists but the homogeneous Ether, that Ether in this condition, undifferentiated throughout, must needs have remained for ever quiescent. In itself, being without the very conditions out of which alone force can be initiated, its inherent potentiality must have remained for ever undisturbed. To what straits, then, are we reduced? We are reduced to hold this, that the dogma of *immanence*, so much proclaimed by philosophers, has no foundation in fact, as a primitive law of being; but that there is a Source of force *ab extra* of this homogeneous and universal Ether, and yet in some respects fundamentally one with it, to which we must refer. We do not posit two essentially distinct and separate substances, and we have as yet pointed chiefly to what lies objective, as the foundation of the world of matter; but what we say is, that while Ether, as we discover it in contact with the material sphere, is of itself *negative* of particulars, there must be a *positive* side wherein particulars fundamentally unite; and that while the *negative side is the platform*

Digitized by Google

on which particulars can be introduced as receptive of them, the *positive side is the spring* from which particulars emanate.

And here it is that we obtain an insight into all the categories of primitive beinghood. We find in ourselves, as persons, a subjective side as well as an objective side: we have no experience of the subjective apart from the objective; but, on the contrary, the consciousness which we first of all and fundamentally have, is the consciousness of self—a consciousness that is characteristic of the material conditions of which the body, as the ground of self, is composed, with its disposition and tendency, we are hereby brought to apprehend the whole category of substance, and to say that on the negative side as the *foundation* of all being, and on the positive side as the *source* of all being, both fundamentally one substance, there are two distinct departments, *i.e.*, in each are two distinct spheres, which never can be confounded, *viz.*—the *objective* and the *subjective*—that the objective department is that foundation out of which *matter* has come to be framed, and that the subjective department is that ground out of which *mind* has come to be manifested. Hence, while we posit but one primordial substance, under the name of Spirit, whose inherent attribute is potentiality or energy, that is the capacity of power—a capacity that is converted into actual force so soon as the initiating element of force, *viz.*, a special quality, is introduced, we have to observe that in this primordial substance or spirit, there are two distinct realms of manifestation:—on the one side, where this primitive substance is *per se negative*, the manifestation being hidden or not apparent, simply because void of particulars; and on the

Digitized by Google

other side, where this primitive substance is *per se positive*, and therefore full of particulars, the manifestation being open as operative Cause. If, then, we find in ourselves a microcosm of the objective and subjective, and therefore crowned as intellectual personalities, are we not warranted in regarding the foundation of all as possessed of this lofty prerogative? Are we not bound to see at the foundation an elevated intelligent Personality, separately standing apart from, and specially distinguished from, the medium out of which the world is framed, and in which the world doth function? The conclusion is inevitable to every candid and honest inquirer.[1]

[1] It is possible to think of qualities and laws in the abstract but it is not possible to think of their existence independent of substance and personality. To assume that qualities could exist apart from the substance in which they inhere, or that laws could come into force apart from the person whose methods of operation they represent, is just as senseless as to assume that breathing might take place in a vacuum. Goodness, wisdom, power, law, are no more possible without a person, than thoughts without a thinker. If you are to have the attributes and abilities of the horse, you must first have the horse. Nay! if you are to have the truths pertaining to a triangle, you must first have the triangle. We speak of "eternal truths"—"truths which were never made, and could not but be, as contained in reason and understanding"—such as the axioms of geometry which none dispute; but how can they be truths, or rather, how can the maxims have any existence at all apart from the *things* of which they are predicated? Even so: as we cannot have human qualities and powers apart from a man, nor the ideal of these qualities and powers apart from the ideal of a man, so neither can we have universal laws or authoritative morals without a God. These we have in the world: moral law and operation must have their fountainhead in a moral Personality. The Eternal Ground of things could no more be set in motion apart from the Eternal Person, than the Eternal Person could exist without his own Eternal Ground. The two are *in essence* one, yet distinct as categories

Digitized by Google

We see from what we are taught practically respecting the prerogatives of a universal uncreated substance, that it has not only the constitution of an absolute homogeneous unity, undifferentiated, but at the same time also in that unity the fundamental character of an absolute co-partnery of conditions in combination, such as to be one whole, without distinction of parts; and that one co-partnery of conditions does not thrust out another, and still another co-partnery of conditions, but that in absolute junction they are one. What then? Why it follows, and follows as a necessity, that while in the

of being. Apart from the Eternal Substance no created being could be manifested; apart from the Eternal Person nothing could be willed, ordered, or made to arise. The denial of a personal God, therefore, involves the denial of the possibility of there being any *thing*. Without question every possible idea of God must include *essence* and *form*. There must be invisibility behind the visibility. If the invisibility be objective and yet operative, it must have an Organ as the ground of operation. What were the boundless Ether if there were no sun expressing its conditions and imparting their cogency? If the Ether is to be a quickening and generating power, it must be through the sun which is in its bosom; in like manner there must be "the Form of God" inherently endowed with qualities to prove that he must be some *Thing* in opposition to no *Thing*. You can no more have manifested existence without form, than you can have existence without some certain *Thing* existing. The Form of God is the Organ of infinite qualities, the Holder of illimitable perfections. The Pantheistic or impersonal idea of God implies the universal diffusion as of a gaseous energy in every direction to infinity. If primarily formless, every one must see at most but a boundless energy, without an initiating prototype to give forth the impress of its own possession. You may believe in a Universal Spirit with essence, as the absolute *ground* of Divine Personality, but you cannot logically believe in a Universal Spirit as the cause of things existing, without envisaging the Form or Personality belonging thereto which we call God. You might as well believe in daylight, and not believe in the orb from which the day-

Digitized by Google

bosom of Universal Spirit thus pourtrayed, there is a divine pantheism, denoting, with generic basis, an Impersonality Absolute, in which all things have their subsistence in gremio; there is also, and as equally, the characteristic of said Universal Spirit, a fundamental Personality containing absolute fulness, *i.e.*, all those conditions of primitive beinghood fundamentally manifested, by which all others are formed, and from which all others have their origin. We thus reach the beinghood of God as personality, and upon the fairest logical principles this personality is *forced* upon us. It cannot in reason be evaded. We are not prepared to define,

light emanates. There is a universal energy in the Ether, but that energy can be converted into force, only in and through the impartation to it of a condition which it can lay hold on and show forth. It is absurd, then, to talk of universal force apart from the Form wherein it primarily exists. Philosophers talk of development through immanent operation *i.e.*, the Universal Spirit fulfilling its own law; but if they do not admit of a primary Form as an existing Personality, how can there be an inherent immanence, *i.e.*, if there be fundamentally no germs to be unfolded or manifested? Many transcendentalists never apprehend the deeper world of real substance and true form, and are taken captive in the meshes of a mere thought-system. They are infatuated with wordy conceits and definitions, but are far away from the real cosmos. Every philosophy which has not for its basis the organic forms of real being is but a chaos of terms. A formless idea is absurd: formlessness can never create an idea. An idea represents a thing that can be seen. Phenomenal nature is but a universe of lower forms suggesting the idea as formulated in the higher region of mind: it is the mirror in which we see the higher kingdom of which Nature is the outcome. What we call the temporal world and our own temporal nature, are strictly eternal powers projected, and working in temporal forms. Thus we ascend from the lowest and rudest forms to the highest existing forms in man, and hereby we are of necessity led to the primary all-forming Form. [See a publication styled "The Supremacy of Man". Hamilton, Adams & Co.]

Digitized by Google

or in any way to confine, this personality; but as we find primitive substance to consist of two separate spheres, the objective and the subjective; and as we find that these two spheres are represented in each of two distinct categories, *viz.*, the *positive*, in which all fulness of particulars dwells; and the *negative*, in which there are no particulars, but which is ever the ready recipient of particulars out of said fulness,—the positive therefore implying a Personality in perfectness for self-sustained wisdom in initiating operation, while the negative betokens impersonality as the ground or platform for the acquisition of special qualities, and for the display of whatever impressionism is carried to it; in short, as we find practically in the operation of the works of Nature, that the latter permits and sustains our own interposition as intelligencies, so we are constrained in order to account for the introduction of the works of Nature, to posit the existence of a Personality which hath its foundation, like our own, in the ethereal or objective sphere of spirit, yet having its crowning phenomenon, like our own, in the subjective sphere of spirit, and, in the circumstances, as constituting an absolute Intelligence.

Whether there be a deeper Personality still, whose foundation lies exclusively in the subjective sphere of spirit, and is thence communicated to the objective, for a representation of primitive Self-hood, we do not say; at all events we should not be able to descry this on any grounds of natural law that seem presently within our reach; but, seeing we have in Holy Scripture a revelation of at least a twofold Personality in the Eternal Father and in the Eternal Son, (in some respects the same with the Holy Ghost), it is a

Digitized by Google

glorious opening up to us of Divine Beinghood, when we are made to see how this possibility might be as to this twofold Personality, as each equally absolute: the Father as having His foundation in *mind*, and from mind expressing itself on the Ethereal platform: the Son, as the Impress of the Father, having His foundation, like ours, on this Ethereal platform, and thence developing itself in mind. There is no doubt a third Form of divine characteristics proclaimed in the New Testament, but into this point we cannot here enter. Notice will be taken of this hereafter, when it will be found discussed in the proper place.

What we are now satisfied in having attained to, as an assurance upon scientific principles, is the existence of a divine Personality whom we must term God. And once having reached this *ne plus ultra* of the fountain and foundation of all things, we have no difficulty in realizing the character of that Mind, by which they have been contrived and brought into being, as all-wise, and powerful, and good—a mind guaranteed to us in His works by the highest moral principles, while, at the same time also, we can distinguish God from His works—a difficulty with which pantheism has never been able to battle, and from which it never can extricate itself. Spinoza, with all his metaphysical acumen, illogically made a pretence of believing in God, while yet he made the works to be part of God himself.[1] The Hindoo theology is essentially pantheis-

[1] Spinoza banished experience from knowledge. All his philosophy is the development of one sole idea, that of the Infinite as absolute substance or being. Here he seems inconsistent, in that he says in one sense it is unconditioned, and in another, that it is determined by attributes and modes. Mere substance, he argues, is God, Who

Digitized by Google

tic;[1] for therein every thing is a part of God; but the philosophy of Hindooism and our modern scientists cannot get over the origination of things. And did we not find that what is called "the homogeneous essence of the universe" has capacity to contain within it endless forms accompanying and representing the conditions of matter, *without disturbing the absolute oneness* of its own essential character, it might go hard with us to find in absolute substance a personality primarily clothed with all the forms or conditions which go to the formation of the universe. Without doubt we are *driven* to a primordial Personality by the very fact that the forms and the conditions which characterize existing forms cannot, by any possibility, begin of themselves, and be framed without a Source from which they are derived; but how or where to find this first Cause would indeed be a difficulty, did we not find that in the primitive and uncreated substance which forms the foundations of the universe, there is not merely that *generic realism*, as the Absolute negatively, which embosoms all qualities without displaying the distinction of any, as the quarry of the world; but also that *particular realism*, as the Absolute positively, which, having the foundation

develops Himself in an infinity of infinite attributes. His *natura naturans* and *natura naturata* make the grand total of his theology.

[1] The first conception of the Hindoo was of some personal being *outside* and apart from nature; but as he progressed in his mental development he became conscious of a power *within*, not apart from himself, and not confined to himself alone, but existing alike in animals, plants, and minerals. The name he gave to this mysterious power was *Brâhman*, or the propulsive power of Creation. Throughout all the Hindoo religions, whatever attributes of personality were ascribed, the deeper consciousness of an impersonal immanent Power displays itself.

Digitized by Google

of particulars in perfect fulness, constitutes the Fountain and Spring of all those particulars which present themselves in Nature. Deity would be imperfect were it otherwise. Were it otherwise there could be no creation, but one universal blank of nothingness—the Zero of Hegel.[1]

An objection has been started to the idea of the divine personality, that it of necessity implies form, and form implies limitation, and that limitation cannot

[1] Hegel sought for, and believed that he had found, a method of constructing absolute science, which method he calls logic. He lays down the absolute identity of thought and being, in fact the identity of contradictories. The *idea* is Hegel's God: the development of the idea is *reality:* the knowledge of this development is *science.* There are three elements or *momenta* belonging to every idea, *viz.*, the idea out of itself, the idea in itself, and the idea for itself. The first embraces the philosophy of nature; the second, logic properly so called; the third, the philosophy of mind. Schelling had conceived the sum total of things as the progressive series of one identical principle, but was never able to demonstrate it. Hegel took this step by pronouncing those two strange and perilous principles, the identity of thought and being, and the identity of contradictories. Logic in the system of Hegel is the science of God considered in Himself before creation, wherein we have an enumeration of being, nothing, quality, quantity, measure, identity, difference. The first link in this chain is *the idea of being*, from which comes out the *idea of nothing.* But being and nothing do not remain as they are. This excites a third idea which Hegel calls *becoming*, as being the idea of development. Hence we get determined being with *quality*, with an endless deduction, which we cannot follow out in detail. If logic has any soundness in it, we must say that if nothing is constituted as the foundation absolutely, then, in the system of Hegel, nothing becomes God! It is curious to find that Hegel repudiated the doctrine of Pantheism. Nevertheless, in spite of his repudiation, Hegel's philosophy must be regarded as identical with that form of Pantheism, which represents God as the One universal Existence, of which Nature is the substantial manifestation.

Digitized by Google

properly be predicated of the Infinite. The objection has no soundness in it. In the first place, were there no limitations in God there could be no eventuality in God, and no space as applicable to God, and therefore no possibility of His creating the one or the other. In short, were there no limitation in God there could not be the power of creation. But, as regards limitation, we see the great characteristic of God in the non-limitation of these characteristics of limitation. Having the platform of infinity to work upon, there can be no prescribed limit to the extension and variety of his works.

One word here, as to what is called the law of Evolution. It is quite distinct and separate from Creationism. Creationism has to do with the primary *construction* of causalities. Evolution has to do with the mere *operation* of causalities already constructed. It behoved God not only first of all to form the atoms, which lie at the basis of matter, with their respective characteristics as to quality; and so to frame them that they must have a relative affinity for one another, but thereafter to conjoin them so as to fulfil a specific purpose; and the adaptations are so remarkable, that it goes hard for even the scientific mind to understand how evolution, which must be regarded as in itself blind unintellectual law, could satisfy the demands of the problem. For example, it must puzzle and perplex the inquirer to discover how such a complex organ as the eye should have been constructed by mere natural law, so as to receive the rays of light and the pictures which are everywhere depicted upon the pupil of the eye, to be conveyed thence as by a conduit-wire, called a nerve, to the territory of consciousness; while evolution can give no explanation whatever, so as to apprehend how that territory of

Digitized by Google

mind exists, or whence that territory of mind emanates. Evolution, however, will be thoroughly understood only when the law of causality is thoroughly understood. In the law of causality, it is well known, that the self-same ingredients, as factors, will in the self-same combination and in the same circumstances produce the same results; but yet these factors will produce different results according to the *order* in which these are conjoined in a combination; and not only this, but different results will be effected according as various influences have been brought to bear upon them.

Accordingly, while every causality constitutes hereby a circle of possible modifications—a circle bounded by limitations which it cannot pass, although with modifications therein, indefinitely produced, according to the kinds of influence bearing upon one or more of the ingredients combined, there cannot be in the thing produced, other than the characteristics which belong to, or are producible from, the ingredients. Hence every causality once formed, must needs be the generic author of what we call *species*. True it is, that one species may be grafted upon another; or more distinctly a new ingredient, as a separate factor, may be introduced into an existing causality; and a new character of offspring will hence be obtained. Scientists have here been fain to bring such a case within the domain of evolution, but it will not bear examination; it is a distinctly separate case. There is but one kind of evolution, *viz.*, that in which variety is producible from the self-same ingredients, according to the treatment which they receive. Evolution, in the very nature of things, cannot bring out what does not exist in causal combination, otherwise causality is no longer causality.

Digitized by Google

Evolution is made to run counter to the true principle of causality. We say every cause must not only have an effect; but (mark this) *an effect corresponding with the cause;* now, evolution is made to bring out an effect, for which there is no cause!

And why should there be any difficulty in creationism? Where once we have established the great fact that there must needs have been a construction or institution of causalities, why should we hesitate for a moment to carry out the principle in all its details? Even suppose our scientists were able to obtain a foundation, as the beginning of things (which they are not) it must turn out an utterly false philosophy, to infer that evolution could account for the things that are. Evolution is but another name for *the law of nature.* The laws of nature can best propagate the things that have been once introduced: they cannot of themselves bring in organisms *de novo.* There is no well authenticated fact to establish this; and as we have seen, in the very nature of things it cannot be; for the very notion destroys the first law of reason, *viz.*, that *a thing must be what it is: it cannot be what it is not.* The problem may be stated thus:—Given certain conditions, combined in certain affinity, what must be the result? This is what is termed science. Science is prophetic. Having the factors, you can tell the effect. Science must needs have recourse to God for the existing causalities of the universe. Science finds in the world, the erection of causalities, in virtue of which, the sun, moon, and stars, hold to their courses —in virtue of which, the fruit tree yieldeth fruit after its kind—in virtue of which, the cattle are continued, each after its kind—in virtue of which, man is confined within the domains of man; and, whatever may be the

Digitized by Google

variety which climate, soil, and training may introduce, each creature is confined to the sphere of its own circle; and hence man cannot get out of the sphere of manhood. Let it once be satisfactorily ascertained that evolution can never take the creature, whose antecedents belong to a certain category of being, out of that category to which it belongs; then evolution will be relegated to its own department—a department entirely dependent on the constitutive agency of an intelligent, rational, and moral Being, for its very existence.

We have referred to the difficulty which Pantheism could never surmount, of drawing a line of demarcation betwixt God and the world; for if there exist primitively but "one homogeneous and undifferentiated Cosmos," it is obvious first, that some power has come in to constitute differentiation, of which it can give no account; and it is obvious farther, that this said Cosmos can never be other than itself developed (we shall say) into endless supputations, each a part of God; and man himself therefore the highest manifestation of God, and therefore God. Such is the conclusion to which man must come, and beyond which he cannot reach, when he stops short at pantheism. There is, as we have seen,—well! a pantheism which lies at the foundation of the forces of nature, and which must account for the forces of nature; but we may not stop here. We are equally compelled to see a divine Personality *in initio*, as well as a divine Impersonality—a Personality prior to the forces of nature and therefore prior to the existence of nature—a Personality through which the foundations of nature were laid, and without which there could have been no nature at all. The same reasoning which concludes for the existence of a universal

Digitized by Google

essence as an absolute Impersonal, in which matter functions, concludes also for the existence in the bosom of that universal essence, and as a characteristic of that universal essence, of an absolute Personal, wherein are those fundamental particulars eternally subsisting which constitute Cause; and which in actuality manifests all that lies hid in the absolute generic substance itself, which, as containing no particulars, yet goes to uphold all particulars introduced. Whatever particulars there are in the personal, they must be regarded as the complement of that which is comprehended in the impersonal; and as we have seen that the impersonal qualitatively embraces the two distinctive attributes which constitute—the one the basis of the objective, and the other the basis of the subjective—it follows that the personal must not only be in possession of the objective, but of that objective as crowned with mind, having self-operative function; and therefore as of necessity the fountain and origin of all the creaturehood of the world. Hence, whatever may happen to be the forms or devices of the varied conceptions introduced in the universe by the purely subjective Father, the Eternal Son as objective to, and one with the Father of all, must, as direct Creator, be regarded as standing aloof *per se* in all the perfection of His own eternal beinghood.

The very fact of man's personality, and of endless forms besides, subsisting in and through the allness of the homogeneous universal substance, ought to have satisfied pantheistic evolutionists, that though allowing this primordial substance to be the basis of the universe, there must at least be the possibility of an uncreated Personality with its own fundamental forms, as the self-

Digitized by Google

hood of the self-same substance. Why not? If man is himself a person endowed with various conditions—conditions assembled into one combination for the purpose of exercising a rational and moral intelligence, what prevents the conception of a *first* rational and moral Intelligence in the self-same boundless ocean of substance, as the primitive expression of positive qualities—an intelligence, by the way, absolutely indispensable to account for the production of the world? And what can we say about man's personality? We perceive therein the objective and subjective combined—the objective in the construction of his body, the subjective in the construction of his mind. It is not until we reach the organisation of the animal economy, that we find any development of the subjective. We can readily understand however, that the glory of the Creator stood, not only in building up a series of compositions out of, and on the basis of, the objective; but that through the objective it behoved Him to build up also a series of objective things, displaying the subjective; and this, with increased enlargement of mind from the smallest adminicle of sensation, till we reach a rational and moral consciousness in man, as the highest and most elevated of all earthly objects. If we can understand the mechanism of man therefore, we shall have no difficulty in understanding the mechanism of the inferior creatures preliminary and preparatory to man. A word or two as to the mechanism of man.

I have to offer a hypothesis as to the *source of mind* which, so far as I know, is new; and so far as I can see, meets all the requirements of the case. The *a priori* philosophy simply begs the question of mind; it cannot tell whence it comes; nor how it comes to be connected

Digitized by Google

with the body: hence to this philosophy the attribute of consciousness is absolute mystery; and it gives to what is called *soul*, an individuality apart from, and independent of the body; and it will have some of its operations, such for example as that called "pure reason," to be conducted without reference to the bodily senses, or the cerebral structure. The *a posteriori* philosophy again, developing mind through physiology, has no help but to land its followers in the depths of materialism. This philosophy assuredly adopts the true inductive method of building its conclusions step by step on facts; but then it is found (explain it as they may) that there must be something wrong in the ascertainment of the facts, or in the proofs, when we can get no further than the cerebral functions, for the display of consciousness under the operative powers of mind. The operative powers of mind, no doubt, must be referred to the brain; but *mind*, with its ability to take in so many ideas without losing its identity, and having as its characteristic, consciousness, which cannot be predicated of matter as such, and which assuredly is not needed to complete our idea of matter, must be on a foundation distinct from matter. What then? Why, having got the idea of spirit in its *objective* aspect (as we think) clearly revealed to us in the etherial medium; and finding in this medium two things which are utterly inconceivable in mere matter:—*one*, that constitutes it to be the universal servitor of all material representations, however many, *i.e.*, without limit; and this, without confounding one force with another; keeping each strictly true to its original, and conveying them or expressing them outwardly (lessened as the square of the distance) in their minutest particulars;—the *other*,

Digitized by Google

in that it gives dynamical character to each varied quality of matter, obviously showing that energy or potentiality is its inherent attribute, without the possibility of exhaustion:—we are in this way, able to obtain a definition of spirit, as distinguished from matter. Matter denotes some special quality conditioned under certain limitations. Spirit as primitive substance is generic quality, with inherent energy, under non-limitation. Spirit intrinsically, as to the *objective* department, is of that universally qualitative character that enables it to take on, to carry, and to convey a representation of the special qualities of matter, and manifests its inherent energy as force accordingly. And here it is that we have an exemplification of the connection and operation of spirit with matter. What is the magnet but polarized steel? Very well, we have in the etherial medium that polarization which exists in the steel, in virtue of which a dynamical influence is manifested in the region of of its influence to attract iron filings. What is fire but the combustion of material substance, creating the sensation of heat? It is the ether that carries the heat; and the ether, thus conditioned, affects our bodies when placed within the range of its influence. What is gravitation but the affinity, which two substances of similar character have to approach one another, carried into operation by means of ether; and the larger the body, the wider the sphere of influence? It is through ether that we account for our own attraction, and that of other material bodies, to the earth's surface. It is through its affection of the universal ether, that we account for the effect of the great body of the sun on the earth, and on the other planets which surround it. It is ether which

Digitized by Google

conveys illumination, and which, under illumination, conveys to our eyes the pictures of the bodies which we perceive with our eyes.

Can we doubt for a moment that it is the self-same energy which is displayed in electricity? We find electricity generated by inducing a current, as it is called, in an iron or copper wire. What then? Why, the analogy corresponds as regards electricity. As light is not only conveyed by ether, but colours are also conveyed by light, as the facts of our common experience in daily life show; so not only is a current induced in the wire by the initiation of disturbance in the cells of a galvanic battery; but the current can be made to convey not only particular forms, but even the qualities embodied in these forms, as when the very sound of the voice is silently conveyed through the wire, and developed on a surface adapted to receive it. Two things are noticeable as regards electricity: first, that the medium whereby the message is conveyed must be of a spirit-nature, because cross messages may be simultaneously transmitted, without interrupting or even affecting each other — a thing impossible were the current merely a movement of the material particles of the wire; and second, that there must be a special quality of ether in the wire as distinguished from the ether outside of the wire—an ether which sympathizes with the wire, and, so to speak, takes on the characteristics of the wire, and which is, of course, therefore confined in its operations to the wire. It is this ether, as pervading *the interior of every material object*, and *expressing the affinity which belongs to each material object*, that constitutes the foundations of force, as manifested in chemical affinity. That there is such an ether in the object, and attached to the

Digitized by Google

object, is discovered by scientists themselves, who have given much attention to this interesting subject.[1]

We are now in a position not only to understand the operations which are taking place in the world, through the influences of light, heat, &c., but also to understand the operations that fulfil their laws in the vegetable and animal economies. It is a universal rule that *all matter functions according to the conditions which belong to it, and the conditions which are associated with it.* Hence by the laws which apply to vegetation and to the living animal structure we can predict its results. Hence we can understand that every organ must needs fulfil its appointed end in the structure to which it belongs. The structure of the human body is one of the most complicated nature. Before its introduction, a series of structures, from the most simple, gradually increasing in fresh accessions as to structure, were brought one after another upon the field of creation; and man came last of all, as holding in his bodily economy all that is to be found in theirs, and something more. In each of these animal stages *a subjective nature* was manifested according to the basis which constituted its bodily structure; and in every case, without exception, *the subjective nature was a representation of its bodily condition*, and sympathized with its capacities. In the nature of things it could not be otherwise, if the subjective nature is intellectually the representative of the objective.

[1] See the papers in *Nature*, by Professor Morris, on "The Matter of Space," Vol. XXVII., p. 458, p. 349; and by Professor Oliver Lodge, on "Ether," in the same periodical; also by Sir J. Herschell; also by Professor Huxley in the *Contemporary Review*, Vol. II., "On the Physical Bases of Life".

Digitized by Google

In what way, then, do we account for the appearance of the *subjective* nature? How do we explain its existence, first of all? It is obvious we must have recourse, even now, to the ideal of an etherial image as the accompaniment and representative of the material object. In man, as in the bodily system generally, there is a *terminus ad quem*, to which, as to a central reservoir, the conditions of the bodily system are carried by nerves: that is, the conditions of the bodily *me* are carried thereto, and, so to speak, unified therein. In this case the foundations of the bodily *me* must be *psychically* laid at this central terminus of bodily states and impressions; and what we say is, that the etherial representation constituted as a basis, forms the objective foundation of the *soul*. But in these circumstances it is, that it comes to be crowned with the subjective principle, because it is in these circumstances alone that room or scope is afforded for the display of the subjective; here it is that the etherial formation is not permitted, as in ordinary matter, to stand alone, because it is here that an inlet is supplied for the attachment of the subjective medium, and therefore of expressing the psychical condition in consciousness. The subjective medium expresses the etherial object (as thus constituted) with consciousness, that is, it displays the selfhood so constituted as a conscious self. And this is what we call *soul*. It is not only pure spirit, but it is spirit in the twofold character of what is essential to its full meaning, having an objective side and a subjective side. The foundations of the *me* are thus accounted for on the principles of ordinary generation; and so accounted for, that the disposition of the creature must always be regarded as derived from the bodily characteristics.

Digitized by Google

The *me*, then, is first of all, the inner spirit, as representing, and founded on, the bodily conditions; and that spirit crowned with subjectivity. Of course, there are constant accessions coming to the *me* by the operation of the external senses; and enriched as the brain of man is with an instrumentality for comparing, abstracting, generalising, and reasoning, the soul comes to be stored with varied knowledge; that is to say, whatever may happen to be the condition of the brain cells, the self-same condition is set forth in the etherial or spirit-medium; and this spirit in the circumstances is completed, as I have said, with the subjective consciousness of its state, drawn from the *loftiest characteristic* of universal spirit; because, in the circumstances, as pointed out, there is scope for its development and display. Of course, it is to be noted that the faculties wherewith mind operates, are found in the cerebral instrumentality of each person—faculties which sufficiently account for the operations of understanding and will. Those of understanding are exercised, when ideas, as impressions on the objective side of the soul become cognitions in the subjective side of soul: those of will, again, are exercised when those ideas are carried to the *me*, as elements *which interest or affect the me*—which then become motives, and which then consequently arouse the action of what is called will. There is no will without a motive, and motives are constantly coming in by the ordinary channels of information, according as the ideas which we receive *affect the me* or not.

Hence the position which conscience has, as the moral arbiter of our actions. Our ordinary ideas, which beget will, are ever watched by conscience, so that

Digitized by Google

they may not be carried into will, unless with the permission of conscience; and conscience, which has been called the moral faculty, is properly therefore regarded as the arbiter of will. But what is conscience? It is the *me* beholding the result of the working of motives; it is the *me* seeing the consequence, if the ordinary desire or impulse were carried into will. If that result is not for the good of self or of the creature concerned, the *me* interposes, and the desire is not carried into execution, it is thwarted. Here we find the very foundations of moral law. Many foundations have been sought for, but it is believed that the principle of *the well-being of the creature* does answer *all* requirements. Moral law applies only to objects capable of pleasure or of pain; and the *me* operates as conscience, or moral law, when there is before the mind a line of action, which affects a creature capable of pleasure or of pain.

And here we are enabled to see what changes the *me* itself must undergo in connection with its training. In its foundation it is of necessity carnal; because what it receives to constitute its very beinghood to begin with, comes from the body of the flesh; and *to begin with*, the *me* is fundamentally the spirit-counterpart of the body of the flesh. In all ordinary circumstances the *me* receives many accessions through education; and a good many changes through discipline. And it is remarkable what sound discipline will effect; yet with all these we scarcely enter the field of Theology proper, if in the discipline we are confined simply to mere outward impressions. The discipline may be very stringent, but apart from the things revealed by God, that application cannot effect that change on the soul which properly is

Digitized by Google

called "Godly". The Gospel alone reveals what is properly regarded as "truth and righteousness". To understand the deep meaning of these words, we must first see that a carnal state of the soul is not the truth, *i.e.*, is not the ideal of God for man;—that the truth which will give the soul a standing for immortality, is the revelation of God as found in Jesus Christ; and we can readily guage ourselves by the criterion, whether, in a collision betwixt the flesh and the Spirit, that is, betwixt the bodily requirements and the demands of God, we cleave to the one or to the other. That which prevails, is the power to which we cling. It is very evident then that a great change has overtaken the fundamental condition of the *me*, when we are found no longer most subservient to the desires of the flesh; but, holding these in secondary regard, we are found adhering to Jesus Christ as the Master we serve. In adhering to Jesus Christ as our supreme Authority, we have that foundation of change laid in the soul, which constitutes a new condition essentially; and in receiving the things of Christ as the principles of the soul, we have that change made on the etherial conditions of the soul,—a change which betokens a formation of its states after the likeness of Christ, and which may well be termed the body (the spirit-body) of Christ. That spirit-body, as regards Christ personally, is now developed into a refined corporeity, fitted for the mansions of the skies; and so it will be with us, when we shall have cast off our present panoply of flesh, if we are not found as to our souls naked, that is unconditioned with Christ; for the things of Christ are those of the new life which prevails in the spirit-region of Heaven.

It has been thought, and even insisted on, by some,

Digitized by Google

that as man has by nature a moral faculty belonging to him, it becomes only a question of time for man to develop by evolution into a true religious being; but this is simply the fallacy which pertains to evolution. Evolution can never banish from itself what is essentially and intrinsically its own, viz., the carnal nature; and again, evolution can never lay hold of what is intrinsically not within its native grasp, viz., the spiritual nature. Evolution has the prerogative of moral law to work with; and there are lofty examples of what may be truly achieved; but evolution comes to the *ne plus ultra* of its range, when it is found that a man will die to save his friend; but evolution cannot understand the idea of one dying to save an enemy. Yet though the world was lying in enmity to God, Christ came, and deliberately went through the process of atonement (and in its most awful and exacting forms): which atonement is by faith *applied to us* in order to save our life. Evolution could never have contemplated this. It knows nothing of the scheme of Christianity, while it could never lay hold of that righteousness, which is the seed of the new life.

Before closing this brief *conspectus* of human conditions, under training for Heaven, I may be permitted to say a few words on "human freedom". This is a subject which, like many others, has been much confounded. It has been asked, How could man be free, if on the one hand, he was led astray by Satan to disobey God; or, if on the other hand, he is led away from sin to righteousness by God? We must know what "freedom" means—in what it consists. Freedom (let it be always remembered) has respect, *not to the operation of law in us, but to the construction of that causality, in which alone law operates.* When a Causality is once con-

Digitized by Google

structed, there *must* of necessity come forth the natural effect. Freedom then lies in the construction of causality; and man's freedom lies in this, that he has the *power of choice* in constructing any causality out of which will shall arise. God, for example (as an all authoritative power), had told man not to eat of a certain tree, and gave sufficient motive power, apart from authority, that he should obey, in that He told him disobedience would be death to him; and it is obvious this command was not compulsion. The devil came, and he questioned with great cunning the accuracy of this impression; and so having removed the motive power which went to uphold obedience, he implanted a new motive power, which went to follow out a quite contrary will. Had there been no lying arts practised, it is difficult to see how Satan should have succeeded. All that can be said is, that, as the lying motive power which Satan planted, and which man chose to adopt (and all the rather when the true motive power was withdrawn), had a strong help from the impulse of the flesh, that impulse was stirred to the uttermost for the supposed good of man, and the agency of Satan prevailed. The consequence was that man became the creature of the powers of the flesh, and the Divine communications were no longer certain of being heard and obeyed.

The case is parallel as regards the change which man undergoes from conformity to the flesh and to the world, by being transformed in the spirit of his mind into conformity to God. There is no compulsion whatever laid on man in undergoing this change. God in Christ is no doubt the author of the change; for man of himself would never come to God, God must first come to man; but how does God come to man? He just reverses

Digitized by Google

the system whereby man was made to fall. He comes to man and says: "The soul that sinneth it shall die". Here is a motive to man to cease from sin. Man recoils from death, man wishes to live: the question then for man is—What shall I do in order to live? God replies—"Repent and believe the Gospel". By repentance is taken away the motive power to sin: by faith in the gospel is implanted the motive power of righteousness. In all this there is entire freedom. There is strong motive power employed, but no compulsion; no compulsion to give up sin, no compulsion to embrace righteousness. Man is free to take home to his bosom, or to refuse to take home to his bosom, the ideas presented to him by God; but though these ideas run counter to his present indulgence in, and enjoyment of, carnal pleasure, yet they present so strongly the fact of his ultimate ruin thereby, that it cannot be but that some would be influenced by the presentation of ruin, and so cease from a persistence in the evil. Once the motive-power to persist in some evil that besets us is removed, it is not so difficult to implant the motive-power which encourages to acts of righteousness. Now it is in the *choosing* betwixt two motive-powers, out of one of which only will can arise (and can alone arise in the direction of, and in obedience to, the motive-power which is laid hold of), that man has the freedom to will. When once the motive is determined on and fixed, the law which carries out the motive of will is a *necessity;* and waits only an outward opportunity for its volition. The principles therefore which proclaim human freedom are very distinct, and are in no way interfered with by the economy of Christianity in its efforts for the conversion of the world unto Christ.

Digitized by Google

Such is a resumé of the principles that lie on the grand arena of Theology—principles drawn from what is believed to be a sound philosophy of human nature, and applied to the interpretation of the Divine Word. It is scientific principles alone that can ever bring the denominations that differ into the unity of the Faith, and consequently into entire oneness, as the body of Christ. We ask our Creeds in vain upon what grounds a general concurrence in Scripture-sentiment may be expected. It is to be noted that the answer of the Confession of Faith is defective. It is right when it says that we are to compare Scripture with Scripture; and as it must be supposed that each Scripture should have its own co-natural and contextual meaning, so this is no doubt the best way, as it is the most impartial way to find the harmonious thought which prevails throughout. Yet there is another ingredient which we dare not shut out; and that is a conformity with the best interpretation of nature; meaning by nature, the works of God in the world, and especially that last and highest work, man himself. This element cannot be excluded as a determining factor in our progress to settled convictions and conclusions as to the teaching of the Word of God. This element forces itself on our notice, whether we will or not. For example, a man cannot believe two contradictory propositions—one that the world was created and framed in six of our common days (the original idea of theology); and another that the formation of the world occupied six vast periods of time (the conclusion from a farther consideration of nature). If he cleaves to the latter he must of course give up the former; in which case, he is indebted to an observance of nature, for a fresh interpretation of Scripture.

Digitized by Google

And so in other branches of thought: If a philosophical conclusion, from which it is impossible to resile, runs counter to a theological statement, it is possible that the theological statement may require a fresh inquiry into the foundations on which it is said to rest; or at all events, some fresh explanation of the term, so that all truth may harmonise. It may be that the philosophy is unsound; it may be that the theology is unsound; but if two propositions on the self-same argument contradict one another, they cannot in the circumstances both be true, though both may be false. What then? All that can be said is, that it becomes us to make honest inquiry, and search into our foundations, if our foundations be threatened. It is believed that a sound and accurate interpretation of nature is attainable—that a rationale of cosmical forces is possible, and will by and by be realised; and that the theory of our subjective states will be accounted for as the law of certainty. When this is attained, then through this shall we find a key to the sound and accurate interpretation of Revelation; and it is farther believed that when in the exercise of intellectual freedom, and the acquisition of assured knowledge, we arrive at fixed and definite conclusions in natural science, and through this at a consistent and natural and harmonious interpretation of the Word of God, then will be presented to the world a unity of religious sentiment and a general concurrence of religious belief, such as will gain to the Scriptures a power and an authority they have not yet acquired. When a true science of philosophy shall have been obtained, then will it of necessity conduct to a true science of theology; and then will the Church of Christ have a name and an influence upon the earth, such as it never

Digitized by Google

before possessed; for it will be constituted on a basis which cannot be overturned.

There is no doubt considerable commotion in the Churches at this present, touching the question of external or political privileges, and touching the question also of what are properly regarded as ecclesiastical regulations; but we egregiously err, if we think that these are the real ailments which most seriously affect the Church. Supposing all political considerations in behalf of the Church were withdrawn—that all endowments together with the civil establishment of religion were abandoned—that a unity also in regard to ecclesiastical organisation were realised, the Church must still of necessity be ill at ease, in not being at one also, as to the principles of her creed. A broad Church in matters of creed cannot stand; for the creed of the Church is the life of the Church, and if the life of the Church is to be *one*, the creed must be *one*.

What we say then is, that the radical evil in the Church lies deeper far than anything the governments of the world can do for it. This very fact no doubt operates as a strong argument with many to question the wisdom, and to dread the consequences of Church disestablishment, in that while the lukewarm and the sceptical would do little to maintain and to propagate principles in which they do not believe, the reality of a Church establishment ensures and preserves a Christian service for the community in every parish. What, however, is essentially required is, that the real and indispensable doctrines of Christianity should be so known, as not to be secretly questioned or denied, but to be most firmly and conscientiously believed; for if dogmas are propounded which run counter to intellectual

Digitized by Google

verities, which men cannot set aside—dogmas which in spite of the utmost efforts to harmonize them with acknowledged truth, are yet divergent and incongruous, we may not wonder at the want of unity, and the want of authority, and the want of strength in the Church. So long as there is direct collision between the conclusions of Science and the interpretations of Scripture, there cannot be but a barrier to the universality of Faith; and either the one or the other must have to give way.

Before there can be a breaking down of denominationalism, and anything like a universality of faith, there must be attained a general agreement between the averments of assured science and those of scripture. This of course implies that in the first place there shall be a clear and cogent concurrence among scientists themselves in interpreting facts in Physics and Physiology—those facts which go to establish an exposition in, and to force conviction to, what may be called the true philosophy of nature; and in the second place, that the interpretation of Scripture shall be found in complete accord throughout all its parts with itself, and also in harmony with all true science. The author believes that such a consummation is possible—that such a day is coming; and when it does come, men will no more be able to resist the teaching of Christianity, however adverse to their natural likings, than they are now able to resist the teaching of a summation of figures, which marks their involvement in heavy and serious responsibilities. Christianity hereafter will not be less antagonistic to carnal tastes and tendencies than at present: Christianity, as such, cannot change its front; but there will be less opportunity in the coming

Digitized by Google

era for its pretended votaries to escape to a refuge of lies. What then? Christianity will come to be no longer militant, but triumphant in the world; and the regulative principles which govern Christianity, as having the authority of God, and the sanction of profound conviction, will become the regulative principles which direct the administrations of the world; and the same spirit will penetrate the governments of the world and the authorities of the Church: no susceptibilities will be hurt, no suspicions aroused, no complaints presented, that the one is striving for a mastery over the other, as if the empire of the one stood antagonistic to that of the other—"for the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ".

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER I.

THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST.

"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise partook of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."—HEB. ii. 24.

MANY have been puzzled and perplexed why Christ should die at all, or why He should be capable of dying, seeing He was "the Son of God with power". Dying, it is admitted, is the most indisputable evidence of weakness, for it is a resignation of all power, an yielding up of all resistance, a submission the most absolute to a superior influence. If the views which some commentators entertain respecting the incarnation of the Lord Jesus were correct, the question of Christ's dying would indeed be an inexplicable mystery: we go farther and say, that it would amount to a self-contradictory proposition. They reason in this way: "Christ's body of flesh and blood was not the same as ours, but the same as Adam's body was before he fell. When Adam came directly from the hands of his Maker his body was intrinsically immortal; but by the fall it became mortal, in as far as by the fall came sin, and by sin came death. But Jesus had no sin, His body was expressly and directly formed in the womb of the Virgin Mary, by

Digitized by Google

the immediate interposition of the Holy Ghost, and therefore could not have been stained by any taint of sin." Such is the statement made respecting the body of Christ; and the statement implies that He must have been born essentially immortal as to His body. They admit that the inference to be drawn from the premises is, that Christ in the circumstances could not die, because death is the penalty of sin,—the wages that follow sin; and consequently that, by some mysterious *fiat* or resolve of the Almighty, a body of essential immortality had been doomed to die.

We shall not pursue the argument here, because this point will come before us hereafter. Only we may just remark that whatever is composed of mere matter is, and must be, liable to destruction, for matter is divisible into parts; and whatever is divisible into parts may be broken up and destroyed. And that Christ was in His body susceptible of death from the beginning, must be tolerably evident from the fact that Joseph and Mary were warned by God to take the child out of the way, because Herod would take steps to kill Him. We shall never discover a ground of immortality by any considerations pertaining to the material body. We believe in the truth of the statement that if there had been no fall, there would have been no death; but this result could arise only from two contingencies, that in the first place there shall be no violence, and in the second place the introduction and maintenance of the sustaining power of life.[1]

We presume that the true ground of immortality is to be found in the penetrating and operative power of the Divine Spirit,—that power whereby alone the human

[1] See *Excursus*, II., On the grounds of human immortality.

Digitized by Google

soul acquires its deathlessness, and whereby alone the bodily members become absolutely "the servants of righteousness"; and therefore do ultimately acquire the very characteristics of the Spirit. We are prepared to adhere to the principle that there is nothing intrinsically immortal in aught that is essentially material; for what is essentially material is essentially destructible. Therefore it appears to me, that Adam was not created essentially and intrinsically immortal, but with the means and the capacity of becoming immortal; for there can be no doubt that he was created under an original dispensation of discipline,—a discipline which demanded that the flesh should in all things be perfectly subjugated to the Spirit, and that when practically proved obedient thereto, it would itself acquire the immortality of the Spirit, and be transformed into a spiritual and celestial body. If Adam's body had been made and constituted apart from all connection with, and servitorship of, the Divine Spirit, that is, made and constituted as a living framework of mere matter, then we may rest assured, that Adam's body, like other merely animal natures, would have been essentially mortal. There is evidence full and complete, that death was in the world, and prevailed in the world, before the fall. Geological evidence doth convince us of this; and it requires no great grasp of mind to see that this was an inherent necessity of the changes which material things were destined to undergo. The very fact that life,—material life, had to be supported and sustained by material things, involved the necessity of one thing giving place to another; for one thing must be the food of another, and one thing, that is inferior, must be therefore devoured by another, for the sake of maintaining superior life. This process

Digitized by Google

was in fact, and without doubt, the constituted law of God's world.

I press this view particularly into notice, that the very foundations of God's world contemplated, from the beginning, the maintenance of a higher life by means of a lower; and that the higher life could only be preserved by the sacrifice of the lower. The earth had to give up its juices to nourish vegetable life; vegetable life had again to be destroyed for the sake of animal life; and again in the animal world, one animal creature was ordained to be the food of another; and all were placed in subserviency to man as the highest of all. But still this did not constitute immortality for man; for however highly exalted some material things hereby became, material things as such could have no absolute immortality. God crowned His work by putting the attribute of immortality on the soul of man, through the bestowment of His own Spirit. What then? It behoved that all material things should be subservient to that Spirit; and not least, that the very body of flesh and blood with all its cravings should be the submissive servant of that Spirit, yea, so submissive as to deny itself, and therefore to sacrifice itself, to the behests of that Spirit. It is of enormous moment to keep in view this situation of things, as *the very constitutional condition of man, when he came from the hands of his Creator: i.e.*, when he was planted in the world to fulfil his prescribed functions. Man had an earthly destiny to achieve from the beginning, before he could be developed into an absolutely spiritual being, in the full integrity of a matured preparation for an eternal and celestial sphere.

What then gave immortality to man? I answer that

Digitized by Google

which could alone give immortality to Adam was the spirit which God breathed upon his soul. He was made capable of receiving the Divine mind; and the Divine mind, as the impress of God, was being gradually established upon his intelligence. The Divine light, and consequently the Divine nature, came to be increasingly ingrained into his soul by the communications of God thereto; through which communications, man must become spiritualized in his being. The body too in the course of time becomes spiritualized; even because, checked in respect of its own carnal and natural functions, it becomes deadened as to the carnal, and comes to be penetrated and upheld by spiritual energy. It is made to be the willing servant of the soul, as pervaded by the Spirit. What therefore, in respect of immortality, fundamentally damaged Adam, was the removal of the Holy Spirit from his soul. "It is the Spirit that giveth life"; for the words of Christ, as being the communications of God, are those which give spirit and life to man. Mark then the grounds of human immortality. They do not lie in the human body of flesh and blood: they never did: no, not even in the created body of our first parents, when God placed them in Paradise; for mere flesh and blood were of the earth earthy; and taken from the earth, were perishable with the earth. "Dust thou art" was the declaration of God. We must see and know, then, from the very nature and constitution of matter, that the body could have no inherent immortality. Matter we know, as a simple fact, was from the beginning, a composition of atoms, which might be separated, and the composition thereby dissolved: matter was susceptible of change, and was expressly adapted to undergo changes. The

Digitized by Google

bodies of our first parents were made of perishable matter, just as the bodies of the inferior creation were, and there cannot be a doubt that, from the beginning, these were susceptible of injury, susceptible of being broken up into parts, and therefore susceptible of death. If the body then were to enjoy immortality, that immortality must not only come from a source outside of itself, but confer a quality upon it, which inherently did not, and does not, belong to it.

Into the particulars of that change I shall not here enter. I may just indicate that Scripture refers to it, when it tells us that there are "bodies celestial," as well as "bodies terrestrial,"—that there is "a spiritual body" as well as "a natural body". Nor can we doubt, that the qualities which pertain to "the spiritual body" do in the first place constitute it to be alone the immortal body; and do in the second place, vary according to the spiritual discipline which the soul has undergone, while in the natural body; for the discipline of souls, as animated by the Spirit of God, enables them to rise superior to the cravings of the body, or to the allurements of the world. Whatever may be regarded as the process, in virtue of which a change would have been effected on man, had there been no fall,—a change from the possession of a body essentially mortal to one essentially immortal, sure we are, that it behoved such a change to be effected, before man could be finally ushered into the regions of immortality. We have an exemplification of that change in the case of the body of the Lord Jesus. Here was He upon the earth, with our mortal body,—accomplishing what the first Adam had failed to accomplish,—in all respects making the human body the absolute servant of the

Digitized by Google

behests of the Spirit,—and in no sense permitting the cravings of the flesh to have any dominion whatever in the soul. What then? He was preparing for the discharge of the carnal body, in order to the manifestation of a spiritual body. This was obviously the case before His crucifixion, when He could pass through the midst of the multitudes at the brow of the hill, without being seen; and when at the transfiguration He could anticipate its glorification. We know that after His resurrection, His manifestation as in the flesh was the exception, and not the rule of His beinghood, while He sojourned on the earth. It would seem that one of the prerogatives of the spiritual body was the power, when the need arose, to put on the characteristics of the natural body. We have yet much to learn as regards the capacities or capabilities of spirit-substance.

But we are told that after the fall, and as the consequence of the fall, the body of man became a body of "sinful flesh"; and that expressly on this account, the body of man became the subject of mortality. The authority of Paul is quoted for this conclusion in these words: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned". We are told that "the wages of sin is death". It must be true then, that sin brought death into the world, when there would otherwise have been life. That the death of the body is more immediately referred to, and that said death is ascribable to sin in the flesh, can hardly be questioned by those who have studied Scripture-statements on this subject.

What can be meant by "sinful flesh"? There is but one such expression in the New Testament, and

Digitized by Google

if we take the original words of which they are the representation, the literal translation is "the flesh of sin," that is, the flesh in which sin has its ground, the flesh from which sin proceeds, the flesh which breeds or begets sin in the soul. This is the emphatic characteristic of the body of flesh, which we have received from our fallen parents; and this all-important announcement has not obtained half the consideration which its profound significancy demands: in fact it has been overlooked for the most part; and where it has not been evaded, its proper and true meaning has not been duly taken into account.

The root of human sin is found in the flesh. Had we no other authority for this conclusion, it would be found in such texts as these, that Christ was sent to "condemn *sin in the flesh*," "and to abolish *the enmity in his flesh*". Paul is very express on this head. He tells us that there is "*a law in our members*, warring against the law of our mind [or conscience], and bringing us into captivity to the *law of sin which is in our members*". Can any statement be more explicit as to the source of sin in the soul? "*In my flesh* (he says) dwelleth no good thing." We forget that what is called "the carnal mind," is mind born or begotten of the flesh, and therefore a mind which represents the character of the flesh. "That [soul] which is born of the flesh is flesh [*i.e.*, carnal]; and that [soul] which is born of the Spirit is spirit" [*i.e.*, spiritual]. The former is the *natural birth* of souls; the latter is the spiritual or *new birth* of souls. The natural birth introduces "the carnal mind, which is enmity against God," because the law of the flesh is a craving for, and indulgence in, carnal things; and therefore it implies the exclusion of

Digitized by Google

spiritual things. Hence it is said, "they [that is, souls] that are in the flesh [and consequently carnal] cannot please God"; and he [*i.e.*, the soul] that is "dead [to the flesh] is freed from sin"; which is tantamount to the language of Peter when he says, "he that hath suffered in the flesh is freed from sin". What then follows according to Scripture-teaching? Why this! He that dieth to the flesh dieth to sin, because the lusts of the flesh are the primary springs of human sin. Hence the great command of the Gospel to "mortify our *members* which are upon the earth"; for it is affirmed that "if we live after the flesh, we shall die; but if we, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, we shall live". This mortification of the deeds of the body is elsewhere called "the crucifying of the old man, that the body of sin [the body which is the source and spring of sin] might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin". And again, it is called the "bearing about *in the body* the dying of the Lord Jesus," who was "put to death in the flesh," and who hath "brought in reconciliation by the body of the flesh, through its death".

We thus get some knowledge of what "flesh and blood" are, when looked to in themselves, and especially when looked to as the governing power over the soul. Flesh and blood were from the beginning essentially perishable elements—elements that were sustained by nourishment from the earth, and which depended on the earth, for the maintenance of their life. Moreover, while flesh and blood formed, and still forms, the ground on which the law of operation for mind in the lower animals subsists, each creature having a mind according to its kind, that is, according to the bodily

Digitized by Google

constitution given to it, as a law adapted for a purely earthly state, and contemplating no condition beyond the earth—such a constitution was utterly deficient, nay, adverse for a condition above the earth—a condition that contemplated a destiny of a spiritual and eternal sort. In the first place, animal life—the life of a constitution of mere flesh and blood, could not give absolute life to the soul: it could not confer a life greater than its own: it could not give spiritual life: it could not give what it had not for itself: it could not give eternal life. In the second place, it could not carry man beyond the horizon of this perishing world. True it is that man, with his rational intelligence, would have a forecast of a future state; but of what sort? It ever has been, and can be only as a reflex of earthly things, and not of a spiritual and celestial state, of which his soul has had no experience. But in the third place, flesh and blood, in the essentials of their life, are antagonistic to the preparation which is needful for a spiritual state, and consequently antagonistic to the law of the Spirit, which demands for the soul the submission and the self-denial of the flesh, *i.e.*, of carnal impulses, in order to spiritual freedom and spiritual action. And this was the condition in which man was made. Man was made with a carnal constitution; yet with that constitution in due subordination and homage to moral and spiritual instruction. Hence, as I have said, man from the beginning, *i.e.*, in his created condition, had to deny himself to the demands of the flesh, in order that he might duly fulfil the law of the Spirit.

Having said this much about the general characteristics of flesh and blood, a point I have deemed

Digitized by Google

needful to discuss, if we are to understand aright what is to follow, we come now to the important statement, that Christ "partook of our flesh and blood". "Forasmuch as the children are sharers of flesh and blood, Christ also Himself likewise partook of the same." Not a word is there here about any distinctions between flesh and blood, as these were originally created, and flesh and blood as they have been found in the generations of man after the fall. Nor, in all probability, does there exist any real distinction, *save the relative one*, in which they stand to the soul, and the consequent development and intensification of various untoward propensities, because of undue freedom and indulgence through the want of restraint, when man lost the presence and the power of the Spirit. Let us mark, however, the circumstances in which, and under which, the body of our blessed Lord came into the world.

First of all, notice what kind of a world He came into. It was a different world from that into which Adam was introduced. Christ came into a world full of tyranny and injustice. Unrighteousness, oppression, cruelty, and all sorts of selfishness were the characteristics of mankind, when Christ came among them. The hand of man was against his fellow man; and violence was the order of things, especially against all who would live godly and teach godliness upon the earth. It could not be, therefore, that Jesus Christ appearing a man among men, and particularly as appearing in public, and publicly questioning the principles of men in vital points of their faith and conduct, should escape the fate of those who ran counter to their fellows upon the earth, who were walking according to the laws of flesh and blood. God, then, in the view of all this (so we are

Digitized by Google

told), "prepared Him a body". What is said of that body? He came forth "made of a woman," that is, *made of the substance of a woman*, made of her blood, therefore, bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh. Whatever, therefore, were the characteristics of the human flesh of Mary, the mother of Jesus, were of necessity the characteristics of the flesh of our blessed Lord! We say of necessity, otherwise, the body of Christ could not in all fairness be said to be "made of a woman".

There has been much metaphysical effort to get rid of this dilemma (for dilemma it has been most mistakingly regarded) by alleging that Christ had human nature in its *essence*, and not simply human nature in its *accidents;* and farther, by alleging that the Holy Ghost in "preparing the body" of Jesus, formed it in its *essential* properties, and not with those *accidental* properties, which would make Christ to have what is called "sinful flesh".[1] I grant at once (what we are expressly told) that the Holy Ghost "prepared the body" of Jesus; for it behoved Him to do so, if Christ must not be brought into the world, as begotten and conceived by ordinary generation. There are obvious reasons why Christ should not be born according to ordinary generation; for it would be impossible in that case to escape His being the representative *immediately* of His earthly father and mother; and *mediately* only of the peculiar race from which He sprang, and therefore that He must needs, in these circumstances, have not only the idiosyncrasies, that is, the peculiarities, temperaments, and proclivities of His direct parentage, but

[1] See *Excursus*, III., On objections to a literal Incarnation or exact participation of our flesh and blood.

Digitized by Google

also the diseases which might more or less have tinged their blood. We have always to bear in mind that Christ came to be *the representative of the race, i.e.*, of *man*, and not the representative of individuals, in which latter case, it would have behoved Him simply to bear the mere specialities of the few; while, as the representative man, it was required that He should have *what is common to the many;* otherwise, how should He be the representative of any? This peculiarity in regard to the foundation of Christ's humanity required the interposition of the Holy Ghost. But that Jesus was born with a body which had that in it which was *common* to the race, cannot be doubted, when it is said that He was born "under the law". All mankind since the fall were under the law; and, therefore, if Christ had to be the representative of the race, it behoved Christ to be "born under the law"—that law which was applied to the race.

What does this language imply? It implies that God had prescribed a revealed law to man, and that Christ was born subject to the demands of that revealed law. And what was this law? It was the moral law, of course, and the moral law in its highest sanctions, as having therein the express commandments of Heaven. Every sentiment, therefore, in the decalogue it behoved Christ to reverence and observe. And not only this, but if in the body of Christ there were the seeds of that out of which sin could spring, it was incumbent that these seeds should be rooted out and sacrificed. And the reason was obvious, because the very foundations of sin must be destroyed; first, to take away all claim on the part of the law; second, to prevent the very possibility of the risings of sin; third, to honour and magnify the

Digitized by Google

majesty of the law; and fourth, to proclaim the majesty and power and supremacy of the Holy Spirit over the whole man—as the sole and absolute governing Power over the body and the soul which constitute the human nature.

Now, what are the facts as regards the life of Christ, and consequently as regards the soul of Christ, as He spent His time on earth, a denizen of this world? Did He not come into the world as one of ourselves; and yet was more than man? To forget this is to lose sight of the very ingredients of redemption. On the one hand He was amenable to the law which condemns sin, because He took what is ours; on the other hand He was begotten, not by ordinary generation, but through the special interposition of the Holy Ghost. In addition to what has been already stated, I may remark that had Jesus been born according to ordinary generation, the foundation of His being would have been in the flesh; and still further, no antecedent reason could have existed why any of the ordinary sons of men might not have been pitched upon, as an object to be specially operated on for the communication of the divine nature thereto. But this was not the way of God. Nothing of course was too difficult for God to achieve; but God could not, consistent with the honour due unto His name, have adopted such a course. God could not thus have set to work to undo the evil created by Satan. All that God could do was to put man into the position of making amends unto God. God could not lay hold of Satan's handiwork, which had brought such mischief into the world, and rectify the evil by Himself and for Himself, and then say—"Here is an atonement made unto God". No! God will never, by the force of His

Digitized by Google

own Almightiness alone, and out of harmony with the attributes of His own lofty and righteous nature, repair the injury done by Satan; it is not the part of God to interfere with the freedom which He has Himself conferred on man, in prosecuting the laws of his being. God having introduced a first Adam, crowned with such privileges of spiritual law as were sufficient as a governing power, and this power having failed through the falsehoods of a cunning Tempter, it behoved Him now to meet this Tempter by the special introduction of a second Adam, specially equipped to meet the existing circumstances in which man had come to be placed. He did not absolutely re-create a new man; but on the contrary, he caused a manhood to be born with the acquisition of our flesh and blood, and He laid the foundations of that manhood in immediate connexion with the Divine nature; and therefore with a power to rule and regulate the humanity accordingly—to curb its tastes and to control its tendencies, so that all the outlets of that humanity should be in perfect harmony with the requirements of Heaven. Thus, while Jesus took what was and is intrinsically ours, in that the laws of our body of flesh were brought to bear upon Him, and of necessity played upon His soul; yet, by reason of the Eternal Spirit which He had, He was enabled to preserve true heavenly life, and to "condemn sin in the flesh". That is to say, He had the real burden of sin while He was inherently without sin. Though He was "tempted in all points like as we are, yet He was free from sin"; nevertheless, being thus tempted from physical and therefore from constitutional surroundings, there behoved to be a perfectioning process made applicable to Him, so that "the enmity in His flesh" might

Digitized by Google

be abolished, and that foundation laid of a new manhood, which should be fitted for the mansions of glory.

There are those who pronounce upon the body of our Lord in very different terms, and for no better reason than that they will not permit themselves to believe that sin could properly touch Him. They forget that He came into a world of sin, and lived in an atmosphere of sin, and that it behoved Him to be touched with the infirmities which belong to ourselves and which carry *us* into the region and practice of sin. They do not consider that hereby they of necessity exclude all possibility of atonement, and take away the position of Saviourship. Roman Catholics, for example, declare what they call "the immaculate conception" of the body of Jesus, by endowing the body of Mary the Mother of Jesus as itself immaculate. Where they have any real authority for this dogma, we know not. It implies that some strange and unheard of miracle had been wrought (secretly wrought) in her case. But we must regard this statement as a pure invention, and a clumsy invention too; for it cannot consist with the righteousness of God. If Mary had been made immaculate, then she needed no redemption; or rather she had been redeemed without a Redeemer, such as *we* need; and saved without a Saviour, such as *we* require; nay, that in a sense *she* had been made the ground of the sinlessness of her son Jesus! If such a process could have been effected by God in the case of Mary, why not in the case of another and another; and then we may ask—why not in the case of all mankind? In which circumstances, Christ in coming into the world performed a work of supererogation—a work that in point of fact was needless—in as far as a case of redemption and of salvation could

Digitized by Google

thus have been pointed to, as effected, irrespective of His incarnation. We say irrespective of Christ's incarnation, because if any might be made immaculate by the secret forth putting of the mighty and miraculous power of God, then the very principle of redemption through sacrifice, and the sprinkling of blood, would thereby be dispensed with and set aside. An argument of this sort destroys itself. We forget that the work of redemption is not a question of mere power. As a question of mere power, God could have extinguished at once all the evil that is in the world; but such a process would not consist with the wisdom of God. Power is but one of the attributes of God, and power may not be displayed in a way that would tarnish the wisdom or justice or any other attribute of His nature. We may therefore be assured of this, that if redemption had been possible without the express intervention and application of an incarnate Saviour, it would have been inexpedient and unnecessary for Christ to have been sent "to condemn sin in the flesh".[1]

Here we may state, that it is only through the fact of Christ's incarnation, that we can thoroughly understand the doctrine of redemption, or have an insight into what constitutes the process of redemption. We cannot enter in this place into the connexion subsisting betwixt the body of the living flesh and the soul, which stands related thereto, but all know full well, as a fact of which they are conscious, that the states of the body are correspondingly reflected on the soul, though it is the province of the soul to regulate and direct the movements of the body. All know that the soul is

[1] See *Excursus*, IV., On the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.

Digitized by Google

contaminated through the inlets of the body; and not merely by the natural cravings which arise under the appetites and desires which have their foundation in the flesh. All outward communications to the soul are made through the gateways of the bodily senses generally.[1]

If such be the case, it is obvious that man required deliverance from the power of contamination from a world of sin; and such deliverance is but another name for redemption. How was this deliverance to be effected? All we can say is, and this is all that we need here say, that, while it was essential that there must be a delivering power, it was requisite that a foundation of our body of flesh and blood should be laid, in order to the inauguration of the new and living way,—that it behoved Christ as the Son of God to take what is ours, that, by the sacrifice of what is ours, there might be the establishment of this inauguration in perfectness.

Incarnation then, under Divine control, lies at the very basis, and becomes the very basis, of any scheme of atonement possible for man; because the fountain and source of the evil in man, being found in the flesh (in as far as the very characteristic of man's fallen condition is that he is "carnal"), it was incumbent that an exemplification should be afforded, that a foundation should be laid, of throwing out the evil, and of bringing in the good, such as could and would be applicable to the children of men; in which case there would be a reparation and recovery of the injured economy of manhood; and in that case a presentation of the new man which "after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," a regeneration in fact which indicates a change of

[1] See *Excursus*, V., On the connexion betwixt body and soul.

Digitized by Google

taste and of character, a change which constitutes a preparation for heaven as the home of the redeemed.

The incarnation then was one of the most indispensable, being one of the most fundamental, requirements in the manifestation of Jesus Christ. It imposed a great work on Jesus Christ, and wholly apart from the work of teaching others, "the work given Him to do" upon the earth was that of atoning for sin,—that of taking away sin, which lies radically in the human members; and so of pervading the manhood with the Spirit of God. It would have been easy for the Holy Ghost to have wrought a great miracle as regards the character of the body of Jesus in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Unquestionably a great miracle was wrought by the Holy Ghost in the very conception of the Virgin Mary; and this was required under two conditions; first, that apart from ordinary generation, the seed of the woman should be constituted into the body of Christ; and second, that the body of Christ should be made generally representative of human flesh, without its being a partaker of the individual peculiarities of any. All this we can understand; but we cannot understand that any miracle was wrought, which would imply an essential change of the body of Christ being made, so that it would be different from the *essential* flesh and blood which belonged to the body of His mother, the body which had to be redeemed. It would have been perfectly possible for the Holy Ghost to have thus wrought a secret or unknown change in the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, so that His body could not with precise and absolute accuracy be styled *our* flesh and blood, but in that case nothing was left for Christ to do; while, moreover, this secret change

Digitized by Google

could have had no analogy, no applicability to our case, as a regenerating process. It was properly the work of the Holy Ghost indeed to effectuate this change, yet in circumstances very different from that secret and creative working, when no opposition could have been offered to the operation in question, and therefore no conquest of Satan could have been manifested. It was left to Christ to accomplish this great work, *viz.*, "the redemption of the body" under all the power of overt opposition; and this, as the very foundation of those experiences we have to undergo in order to our partaking of Christ's body, that is in order to our partaking of that body which essentially belongs to the spirit-body of eternity, and for which we have to undergo those experiences of which His body was the partaker, that is, those experiences which restrain the flesh from dominion in the soul, and therefore those experiences which constitute the redemption of the soul from sin—those experiences which are made applicable to us from him, by the Holy Ghost.

We see then, that it was indispensable that Christ should be born with a body like ours; for had He not obtained a body like ours, He could have had no victim to offer in sacrifice for sin, unless by relegating Himself into the category of the Old Testament types, which taught the lesson of atonement, but were in themselves no real atonement; and if He had had no sacrifice to present as a real atonement for sin, He could not have been a High Priest before God, nor a priest of any sort whatever; for every priest must needs have an oblation to offer unto God, and among the oblations, as the foundation of all others in the case of man, there must be that sin-offering which constitutes the sacrifice of sin, and

Digitized by Google

consequently the putting away of sin, without which no offerings can be acceptable to God.[1]

See then how "it behoved this man to have somewhat to offer": see how it was with the Lord Jesus. His body was verily like the body of His mother, in that it contained the substance of His mother, being fundamentally nourished with her blood,—like the body of "Abraham," like the body of "David," like the body which belonged to "the fathers"; in short, like all other human bodies. It was essentially *ours*, having our infirmities: it was essentially *mortal*, it made Him one with ourselves; and the great work of Christ was to make it essentially *immortal*, to make it a spiritual body, and through this as a foundation of immortality, to make us one with Him. His body, as born into the world, could be injured as ours can: His body had a living heart as ours has: that living heart did beat as ours does: His body had arteries and veins filled with blood as ours has: it had organs that played their part in the living frame in order to health and vigour, even as ours has: that body was susceptible of pain like our own: it hungered and required food, it thirsted and required drink, it wearied and required rest: it worked at a human trade, and required periodic sleep: it brought forth groans and tears, and it experienced an agony and bloody sweat, in prospect of the human penalties of which He was the bearer. The injuries, whereby He died upon the Cross, exemplify all that we affirm. All indicates that the outward man of the Lord Jesus was *one and the same* with the outward man of the race of humanity.

If further clear and emphatic statement were wanted

[1] See *Excursus*, VI., On the Nature of Redemption.

Digitized by Google

we have it from an infallible source. Look at the Scripture which introduces this chapter. Is it possible for words to declare more pointedly, more formally, or more distinctly, the self-same identity of Christ's body to ours? "For as much as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He *also*, Himself *likewise*, took part (partook) the same." The "*also*" emphasises this, that *He*, even as *we*, took flesh and blood. But not content with an "also," the author, in order to be very pronounced and decided on this question, inserts *Himself likewise*, where the meaning unquestionably is *even he, after a precisely similar kind.* Not only is there no distinction, no modification, so much as hinted at; but the writer would seem almost to go out of his way to make the statement beyond the possibility of question, as if he had said:—"In as far as the children, for whom redemption is required, and to whom redemption is now vouchsafed, are partakers of flesh and blood, here also is one who has become a fellow-partaker with them, being man alongside with men; and one with them in all the essential qualities which pertain thereunto, and consequently liable to death; yes! and submitting to death, that through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is the devil". And, as if the emphatic language here employed were not sufficient, he goes on to say:—"Verily He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham".

Mark, "The seed of Abraham!" Can any one, in the face of this, say that Christ's body was not truly and really of the self-same sort as the human body, which characterises ourselves—I mean a human body in all respects one with ours, so far as it characterises *the*

Digitized by Google

race of man? If it was different, then Abraham's body of flesh and blood was not the same as ours! If different, then David's body of flesh and blood was not the same as ours! If different, then the flesh and blood of the Jewish people were not the same as ours; for Christ is equally spoken of as the seed of David and sprung from the fathers. But it was the same, if we are to believe the Scriptures; it was the same, if we are to give to the Scriptures fair and honest interpretation.

Can we then (after giving the Word of God freedom to speak the revealments of God) venture to question the averment, that the body of our blessed Lord was a body of flesh and blood, one and the same with our mortal bodies? The inspired writer, as if anticipating that this conclusion was one not likely to be readily admitted by the Church, and as if having a prophetic glance of the face and features of the Church when Christians were yet but imperfectly instructed in the person of Christ, and when Christians would therefore say, like the Apostle Peter, when he was in an infantine state of knowledge respecting his Master and his Master's work—"Be it far from Thee, Lord! this shall not be unto Thee"!—goes on to say—"Wherefore, *in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren*". What language could be more particular, or more peculiarly instructive, as to the precise character of our Lord's incarnation? Nor does this exhaust all that the inspired writer proclaims. He had just said a little before that "both He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are all of one". *One what?* Why, *one flesh and blood!* one bodily substance! one human nature fundamentally! It can be nothing else, there can be no other conclusion; for observe what the writer adds—

Digitized by Google

"for which cause He is not ashamed to call them *brethren*". What is it which makes all men brethren? Is it not the fact that they are partakers of the same flesh and blood? This then it was which made Christ to be born our brother according to the flesh. Suppose any one were to draw the inference that the text now referred to, *viz.*, that the sanctified and the Sanctifier are fundamentally all of *one Spirit*, this would be not true, but indeed a self-contradiction. It is not true that the people have fundamentally the same spirit as the Sanctifier, for they are naturally sinful, and He is essentially righteous: moreover, if they were radically of the same Spirit, then would the children need no sanctification! But so very express and so very explicit is the Apostle on this very important theme, that he concludes, as we have already noticed, by saying—"in all things (in all respects) it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren"; and mark the purpose! "*that* He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest (in offerings or sacrifices) to God". Here shines forth the reason of the necessity of Christ's body being one with ours; for how otherwise could Christ have been a priest having in Himself a victim to offer in sacrifice unto God? If we, as followers of the Lord Jesus, and under Him, made "Kings and priests unto God," are required to "present *our bodies* as living sacrifices unto God, which is our reasonable service," surely it behoved Him, if He was the great High Priest, to have "somewhat to offer" as a sin-offering unto God; and what else had He but the body of flesh and blood, which, as a power demanding authority in the soul, He had to dethrone from the soul; and we are expressly told that it was

Digitized by Google

this, as the body of sin, which He nailed to the cross (Col. i., 22; ii., 14).[1]

This view of the incarnation of our blessed Lord, lies far deeper than many are apt to imagine. It is the very basis upon which the Divine scheme of redemption rests, the very hinge on which the true scheme of human redemption turns. We cannot wonder at the Apostle John, in the view we have now pointed to, laying so much stress upon the doctrine of our Lord's true incarnation, when he says: "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this (he adds) is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world" (1 John iv. 3). These are weighty and momentous words; nor do we weigh them sufficiently. How often, how generally, are they passed by, as having reference to certain phantasiasts who thought that Christ did not really appear in the flesh, and was not really crucified in the flesh, but that man had been deluded by a mere pageant or phantom, and not the reality of a substantial Christ.

There is no evidence that any such ridiculous notion ever actually took hold of the mind of the Church; and no such belief has ever been propagated in the Church. Let us then look deeper into this question; and let us tremble as we inquire. The Apostle can hardly make reference to such a delusion, as was never seriously entertained; and, among the enthusiasts of all sorts, with which the world abounds, is not now entertained

[1] See *Excursus*, VII., On the Foundations of Priesthood.

Digitized by Google

by any professing the christian name. It is to be feared that those parties must needs be referred to, who deny that the flesh of Christ's body was one and the same with the flesh of our body, which view seems tantamount to denying that Christ came "in the flesh". And he points to this as a sore and an evil which was to come upon the Church; and which even then had already had its entrance into the world. But only its entrance: it had not in John's day fully developed itself: it was an evil which would come to prevail in the Church, as the Spirit of Antichrist itself. What are we to understand by the Spirit of Antichrist? We are to understand the proclamation of Christ in a form which is not only not the true Christ, but which is contrary to the truth of Christ.

Antichrist is the assertion of a Christ, with characteristics which do not constitute the true Christ, and without characteristics which are essential to the true Christ. This is the Antichrist that John tells us would develop itself in the Church. Nor can we be mistaken as to the form in which it would shew itself. "Many deceivers (says John) are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." In fact, he would give us to understand that this point, as touching the character of Christ's incarnation, forms the foundation of antichrist. It is of vital moment, therefore, that we search well into our foundations, and narrowly examine our sentiments, on so absorbing a subject. Do we, or do we not come under the category of judgment which is here so fearfully condemned by the Apostle? Is it quite enough for us to agree that Christ had a body of flesh and blood? The real point at issue is—Do we acknowledge

Digitized by Google

that it was *our* flesh and *our* blood of which He was a partaker? If there be a human flesh and blood, which is not in all respects literally *ours*, then such was not the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. What is ours was His; and what was His, He took as ours that He might redeem it;[1] that is, that He might "sanctify" it; that is, that He might "perfect" it before God the Father; that is, that He might adapt it for eternal glory. This was the work given Him to do; and He "finished the work given Him to do". We are thankful to find these words in our Confession of Faith:—"The Son of God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon Him man's nature, with *all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof*, yet without sin; being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, *of her substance.*" This is tolerably plain. And farther it is said in the same chapter that "the Lord Jesus in His human nature, thus united to the divine, was *sanctified* and anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure, &c.," intimating very unmistakably that the body of the flesh of our Lord was such, that a special work had by Him to be executed thereon, in order to the execution of His mediatorship, and the establishment of that better covenant of which He was the Surety.

We shall have occasion in another chapter to shew more abundantly the precise work which Jesus had to execute in the fulfilment of His great mission: our concern for the present is with the incarnation of Christ, and with what body He came into our world. We do

[1] See *Excursus*, VIII., On Christ being at once the Priest and the Victim.

Digitized by Google

not, of course, pretend to explain by what process the Son of God became flesh; but having once ascertained the fact, we do obtain some insight as to the burden of human sin which He bore, while yet He was "without sin". To grasp this great idea, in all its fulness and in all its fairness, has not been an easy task for the Church, nor for any section of the Church. If flesh, in the scripture-sense of a carnal power dominating or seeking to dominate in the soul, signify *sin*, then "the Word made flesh" would mean the Word "made sin"; and we have it so declared. But here is the difficulty:—How, in the very nature of things, could "the Word" be "made sin"?

Who and what is *the Word?* "The Word" is set forth in the Scripture as the Eternal Son of God, and "the express image" of the Father: "the Word" is declared to have "made all things"—all worlds, angels, men, inferior beings, in short, all creation; and yet the Word is said to have become incarnate. Here is the wonder of wonders! Can we intellectually lay hold of the revealments thus made, and adjust them satisfactorily in our own minds? When the Son of God is said to be "made flesh," we are surely not to suppose that the divine nature was converted or transformed into flesh, still less that the divine nature was cancelled or extinguished in the manifestation of the flesh. As well might we suppose the foundations of all being to be cancelled. God, as touching the very foundations of existence, is the essence "in which we live and move"—in which angels live and move—in which all creatures live and move—in which the natural laws of all created things have their functions. To talk of the conversion of this Being into flesh, or of the

Digitized by Google

extinction of this Being in flesh, would be to talk of absolute annihilation!

But further: when we say the Word was "made flesh," we are not to suppose that "the Absolute" was either essentially or intellectually *confined* to a human body. This idea is no less impossible to entertain, because the limitation of the divine nature within the precincts of the human body, would be the exclusion of the divine nature from the universe around, and by consequence it would infer a *confinement* of that nature which is impossible to be received.

What then are we warranted to believe when it is revealed to us that "the Word was made flesh"? We are warranted, and, I think, bound to believe that the divinity had its expression, its form, its impress, its χαράκτηρ (Heb. i. 3), as the basis and nature of that Being, which took the body of our flesh, given to the Lord Jesus, as the channel of its outward manifestation; and farther, we are warranted and bound to believe that the consciousness of the body of the flesh was *additionally* developed on that divine platform which contained that expression; and that this imprint of God supplied a separate and independent set of experiences, in immediate connection with, and in direct supervision over the soul, first as representing that human body, and second as requiring the communications that come through it from the external world. Wherefore, we have in this latter case, on the one hand, the foundation, and growth, and entire manifestation of manhood, very much in analogy with what takes place in ourselves; and apart from this, and beyond this, and indeed as the independent crowning agent, we have, on the other hand, the divine basis, ever present as the root of the

Digitized by Google

divine nature, with its everlasting wells of intelligence and of grace for the soul, so far as needed, or required to be put forth, in its direct connection with the humanity thus developed in the person of Jesus. In this way, then, the divine Word, as receiving and bearing for separate and independent possession, all that came from the human mechanism, became what the Scriptures term "God manifest in the flesh," and in a true and proper sense "made flesh," while yet He retained His own untarnished being.

It may be asked:—Do we not make the Divine nature to be a partaker of sin, when we arrogate that which pertains to our very body of flesh and blood, as applicable thereto and as developed therein? We answer, that intrinsically this is simply impossible: God cannot be touched or tainted with evil, however much he may commingle therein. True it is, that Christ was "made sin," in the very fact of His taking our body of sin; and true it is, that He bore the burden of sin, in the exposure of His soul to the assaults of sin, assaults from the devil, assaults from the world, assaults from the flesh; but in His soul, as pervaded by the Divine Spirit, He was always antagonistic to these assaults.[1] Not one sinful craving ever had dominion over Him, however much He was encompassed, and beset, and pressed thereby.

But by and by these very assaults themselves passed away, and were no more, as He came finally to overcome them one by one. The devil could work only through the flesh; but though the most insinuating and artfully laid schemes were tried, Jesus successfully set at nought and resisted them all. The flesh had no

[1] See *Excursus*, IX., On Christ being made sin.

Digitized by Google

dominion over Him. While "the Sin-bearer," in that He was the bearer of our body of flesh and blood, He was also the Sin-destroyer—the Redeemer from sin, in that He broke its power, and destroyed its life. And this process is what is called "perfecting" the body of Jesus. There are bodies terrestrial and there are bodies celestial; and Jesus purchased the body celestial, by the sacrifices to which He subjected the body terrestrial. And the process constituted the death of the body of sin, so that in the end He could say, "The devil cometh and hath nothing in Me"; the assaults of the devil and the temptations of the world had nothing to rest upon, because the flesh had become dead to their charms. The flesh as found in ordinary man, and even as subsisting originally in Christ, had come to be dead, dead in its ordinary incitements, dead in that it was thoroughly mortified to all that is in the world, its gifts, its pleasures, its dainties: it was now capable of transformation into the body celestial. Hence we can understand the language of Saint Paul when he says, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth we know Him so no more"—no more in that character, because "the enmity in His flesh being abolished," and the new man being perfectly formed, He became "sanctified" and "finished" for that glorious change which awaited Him, when He should be raised to the skies, and be placed at the right hand of the Father.

We have much to say on this all-important subject, especially as regards the work of the devil, both in its process and in its effects on the human constitution, that is, of the origin and character of that sinfulness into which man fell, by the artful interposition of the father

Digitized by Google

of lies, and finally, of the precise warfare which Christ had to wage in rolling back the tide of sin which had been made to overwhelm the soul. What can we say here, but exclaim:—"Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ": "put ye on the new man which is formed after the likeness of Christ". "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature: old things are passed away: behold all things are become new." In that case, the old man with his sinful lusts is crucified; the new man with his renewed tastes and tendencies is founded and built up within. This, in plain language, means that the work of the devil is destroyed, and the life of Christ is instead planted in the soul. This is redemption: this is regeneration!

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

LIABILITIES ATTENDING FLESH AND BLOOD.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partaken of the flesh and blood, He also, Himself likewise, took part of the same, that through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."—HEB. ii. 14.

I HAVE generally discussed the great question of the incarnation of our blessed Lord: it is the prominent point mooted in the first part of the verse which I have assumed. We have seen that the Scripture gives forth a statement as strong, as it is plain and positive, that the Son of God assumed *our* flesh and blood; and if *our* flesh and blood, of necessity the precise character of Christ's incarnation is indicated thereby. We must be honest with the Holy Scriptures, and receive what they obviously reveal. No greater evil can overtake the Church than coming to them with thwarted views of our own, and turning their clearly revealed word into our own distorted preconceptions. This very subject of the incarnation lies at the basis of true religious principles, and constitutes the foundation of our true religious life; and it is of unspeakable moment that we should be truly and duly informed what was the nature of that body of flesh and blood, which our Saviour took to Him, and what effect said body of flesh and blood

Digitized by Google

produces upon every soul of ordinary manhood that comes into the world, in order that we may see the precise work which Christ had personally to perform; and then, in order to see what, under the grace of Christ bestowed upon us, it is incumbent on us to be and do, that we may become like Him.

Happily by an honest, meek, and teachable spirit, faithfully interpreting the Scripture-revealments on the subject of the incarnation, we feel as if we were not permitted to entertain a single doubt as to its nature and character. Even when we are briefly but comprehensively told by the Apostle John, that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," we are confined to one conclusion, *viz.*, that the Word was made *our* flesh. We are bound to suppose, if no *caveats* are by the Apostle interposed, that the flesh spoken of is *our* flesh, that is, the flesh of man as he is presently found in the world; first, because we practically know of no other, we have experience of no other; second, because as man, He came among men as they now are, and acknowledged men as they now are to be His "brethren"; third, because in common reason it behoved Him so to come, on the expressed ground that He came to take upon Him what is *ours;* and this, in order to redeem it; fourth, because as Man, He was outwardly undistinguished from other men. There is no hint given, much less is there any averment made, that the least distinction was ever observed, or in point of fact that the least distinction really existed, betwixt the flesh of Christ and the flesh of which our bodies are made. Are we warranted then to come in between God and His precious Word, and to introduce modifications of our own—modifications and changes which assuredly

Digitized by Google

God hath not made, in that the Scriptures give no countenance whatever in respect of those? No truly intelligent disciple of Christ, honest to the Scripture, will say so. I do not at all say that any overt intentions exist to change the Word from its true and proper significance; but how often is it, for the sake of a foregone conclusion, that some are more desirous to harmonise the Scriptures with a foregone conclusion of their own, than really to harmonise the Scriptures with the Scriptures. I may take up a particular doctrine of Scripture, and carrying it out into paths which do not belong to it, make other Scriptures to *bend* to those paths thus displayed, and so offend against the faithful interpretation of the Word; and thus it is that we find inconsistency in the Word, an inconsistency not intrinsically there, but only through our teaching. We may have the best possible intentions in introducing and asserting dogmas which *we* may think needful to avert seeming antagonisms to what we have already received as Scripture-conclusions; but it is a dangerous game to play—first because mysteries and apparent contradictions (such as, that Christ was "made sin," and that Christ was "without sin") come, in the course of Scripture-criticism and the advancement of our Scripture knowledge on the details of the subject in question, by and by to be cleared up; and second, because under any circumstances (contradiction or no contradiction) a faithful grammatical construction, taken along with the context of any passage is alone the safe harbour of interpretation; third, when this fails to help us, a comparison of parallel passages, with the significations in each case fairly brought out, will seldom prove unsuccessful in getting over the difficulty; fourth, because

Digitized by Google

sooner or later texts and interpretations come to the surface which fly in the very face of our unauthorised modifications.[1]

I have made these remarks in consequence of the persevering and persistent endeavours that have been employed to make out that the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ's body was not essentially and intrinsically the same as our own. I have appealed to the verse which I have adopted as a heading, as peculiarly strong and expressive on this point. Look at it for a little, once more. "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also, *Himself likewise* (παραπλησίως, *i.e., coming alongside of us as a neighbour*) *shared the same.*" Such really is the very emphatic language of this Scripture-passage, so that, as a question of criticism, one wonders how any contrary view should have at any time been entertained; much more, how any contrary view should have come to prevail in the Church. Nor are we dependent (as I have indeed noticed) on this single passage; but there are others almost equally strong, spread over the Divine Word. And what can we have more than the statement that "it behoved Him to be made *like unto His brethren in all respects*"; and this, as it is expressly stated, "*that* (in order that) He might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in offering sacrifices unto God; and in so doing to make reconciliation for the sins of the people". And here the process of so doing is distinctly laid down, when it is said, that "He Himself suffered, being tempted"; (tempted by sin, He suffered in putting sin to death), therefore, "He is able to succour them that are tempted". He can bestow not only sympathy, as He is willing to

[1] See *Excursus*, X., On Christ made under the law.

Digitized by Google

bestow this, but He can bestow on all that what is needful from His own inner life, in order to the fulfilment in them of the same great end, *viz.*, the putting away of sin.[1]

We take it then, as made evident to us, that Christ "shared the flesh and blood" of which the children of men are partakers. We inquire now more particularly what is meant by the expression "flesh and blood" in Scripture. Let Scripture here be its own interpreter. When Peter made a good profession in acknowledging Christ to be the Son of God, what did Christ say to Peter? "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee": that is, minds that are begotten of flesh and blood, and that are characterised by the carnal sentiments which are common in the world, and that are instructed from the world through the senses, which connect them with the world; and that reason upon that instruction thus communicated, could not have imparted this divine knowledge to your soul. The native mind of the natural man is not able to achieve for itself such information as you have now displayed; but you have gathered it in communion with, and consequently by communication from, My Father Who is in Heaven.

Again, Paul says, "When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me, I conferred not with flesh and blood". He conferred not with men getting their instruction by means of the instrumentality which flesh and blood supply; for they had no means of helping him towards a knowledge which they could not possess—the knowledge of divine truth.

Again, Paul says, "We wrestle not against flesh and

[1] See *Excursus*, XI., On the nature of atonement.

Digitized by Google

blood, but, &c.," that is not against those impulses merely, (or shall we say) those sentiments and cravings merely, which are generated by the flesh and blood of which man is a partaker,—cravings which, as strivings after the gratification of a carnal nature, are characterised as "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life," and which are opposed to the self-denying principles of the gospel; but against principalities also, whose very nature is wickedness.

Again, the same Apostle says, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"—that is, flesh and blood as we now possess it—flesh and blood as a corrupt and purely terrestrial element—flesh and blood as liable to disease and injury, and decay and death—that is flesh and blood as reflected on the soul in its sin-smitten and perishable condition, cannot inherit Heaven. And the Apostle confirms this interpretation when he expounds the expressions referred to, as indicating that "corruption cannot inherit incorruption". Our bodies of flesh and blood are essentially corruptible, and must be changed; and this change is elsewhere spoken of by the same Apostle when he says—"The Lord shall change our vile body, literally, *the body of our humiliation*, the body that brings us into humiliation, because it brings us into sin, and into alienation from God, as being "the middle wall" that separates us from God, "that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body," the body which has obtained glorification, as being no longer a perishable body, or one out of which any sinful propensity is derived, or of which any sinful propensity can be predicated.

In this exposition, we have an all-important truth set before us. Being told and taught that Christ took our

Digitized by Google

"flesh and blood," without any hint, the most distant, that He took them under any modifications; and being told further that such "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God"; and knowing as a simple fact that Christ bodily ascended into the skies,—that He was admitted into the heavenly mansions, and that He now sits as the Glorified One, at the right hand of the Father, it must needs have happened therefore, that a change was wrought upon His body and blood, so that from a "terrestrial" they were converted into a "celestial" consistency and character.

Have we not evidence of this? Why, if it were only in the statement that Christ was once "known after the flesh, but is now thus known no more," there would be enough to support the fact of such a change; and that this change was effected on Christ's body, is boldly stated by the Apostle, when he tells us that there is a "circumcision made without hands,"—that Christ underwent that circumcision, and that said circumcision consists in "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh". What did Christ actually do? He "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers he made a shew of them, openly trampling over them in it" (Col. ii. 14). Such is our English version; but much more emphatic and much more explicit is the translation which we prefer, as follows: "Blotting out the handwriting *in* its principles (dogmas, decrees, or tenets) that was against us, that was contrary to us, He also took it out of the way by nailing it to His cross; and having stripped Himself of its government and authority, He

Digitized by Google

openly exemplified this, by triumphing over the same therein". What was the handwriting against us which Christ blotted out? not the ceremonial law as many teach, for with no kind of propriety can *it* be so characterized, but the imprint, the impressionism, the carnal impulse that came upon the soul from the flesh, and which, from the flesh was as it were written upon the soul, and which in ordinary man gave to the soul its enmity against God.[1] Christ, in the passage now quoted, is said to have blotted out this handwriting in its principles (decrees), or as it might be rendered in its dogmas or demands, so that there was no possibility of a fresh rise of such impressions on the soul, and consequently there could be no renewal of their sinful tendency.

And how did He do so? The answer given by the Apostle is,—that he put off from Himself (ἀπεκδυσάμενος), stripped Himself of such antagonistic governments and authorities as beset Him from the flesh, and gave a public exemplification of such disciplinary restraint, when he permitted the body of the flesh, as the primary source of this handwriting on the soul, to be nailed to the tree. Nothing could be more emphatic than the teaching of such a passage,—a teaching confirmed by many passages of Scripture,—passages which speak of Christ as "rending the veil of His flesh": of His "breaking down the middle wall of partition" which separates the soul from God: of "abolishing the enmity in his flesh": of "condemning sin in the flesh": of his "consecrating a new and living way for us *through the veil*, that is to say (through the rending of)

[1] See *Excursus*, XII., On the handwriting of ordinances and the interpretation of Col. ii., 14, 15.

Digitized by Google

His flesh". If Christ really took our flesh and blood, is it not rational to suppose that He had "cures" to effect thereon? And what does He actually proclaim? "Behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow; and the third day *I* shall be perfected". Can the grammatical meaning of such a sentence be perverted? If "sin in the flesh" was the work of the devil, the impulses which came from the flesh, as fighting against the law of the Spirit, may well be called "devils". And if the very remedy which Christ came to provide, lay in the sacrifice of sin as seated in the flesh, well might Christ speak of doing cures from day to day, as He went through all the experiences of this life.

And to whom do these cures more immediately refer? There is no evading of this question: it is to Himself; for after this course of cure has been undergone He says, "*I* shall be perfected". The passage will admit of no other application; for when certain of the Pharisees bade Him depart hence, because Herod would kill Him, He seems to answer, as was not unusual, with a profoundness that touched the secret springs of redemption, as if He had said 'Kill Me! I came to be killed! The great object of My being in the flesh is to be killed—to be sacrificed in the flesh! I am being put to death in the flesh, in that I am Myself destroying all those powers of the flesh, that would war against the spiritual well-being of the soul,—those powers which are in truth the emissaries of Satan; and by and by I shall give up the life of the flesh in its most absolute form, for the sake of entire obedience to the Spirit, and then I shall be perfected, because all will have been fulfilled, which can be demanded in the sacrifice which humanity

Digitized by Google

has to render, in order to a full satisfaction before God'.

It seems to us obvious then on Scripture grounds, that Christ, under the conditions of incarnation, had a special work given Him to do, a work first of all upon the very body of flesh and blood which constituted the foundation of humanity,—a work which the law, as given by Moses, was unable to achieve in ordinary man, because that law however severe and however imperative, was "weak" in not having the help of the Holy Spirit to cope with the strength of the flesh, and therefore weak to condemn and to destroy "the law of sin in the members". The fact that Christ took our very flesh and blood not only involved the fact that He had this law of hostility playing upon Him; but the fact also, that He had the Spirit in unsparing measure, to resist that hostility and to break it down, involved a power which was not in ordinary man; and He did break it down, He did completely destroy it, so that He could say at the last, "I have *finished* the work which Thou, O Father, gavest me to do"; and that being done, He could claim, and did claim, and did receive, as man, that eternal life and glorification which was the utmost desire and the joy set before His human consciousness. Ordinary man was incapable of accomplishing such a sacrifice as Christ underwent; for want, as I have said, of that powerful and counteracting Spirit whereby alone the instigations of the flesh can be restrained and mortified; but Christ, "through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself up to God"; that is He sacrificed the principalities and powers, even the sinful dogmata that ruled in the body of the flesh and which ran counter to God; and this in obedience to the behests

Digitized by Google

of the Spirit of God; and this moreover He did "without a spot" or stain upon his soul. Or as it is otherwise expressed, "He partook our flesh and blood, that through death (the death of this flesh and blood, as being the life of the body of sin, which had to be sacrificed) He might destroy (or rather *discomfit* or *frustrate* or *bring to nought*) him that had the power of death, that is the devil".

It is needful particularly to notice here the term employed, as applicable to the devil. The word "destroy" is not a happy expression; for it rather obscures, than brings out, the exact meaning of the sacred writer. *Destroy* means to extirpate, or exterminate, or consume; but the devil is not destroyed in this sense; he is not brought to an end, as if his very being were abolished. The devil has essential immortality, in that he has the things of God which give immortality, only he has these perverted; and therefore the devil and his angels live and cannot die; but though the devil is not in person destroyed, the *work* of the devil on man may be destroyed, and thereby *the devil may be frustrated*, and his aims and ends *brought to nought*. And this it is which hath been effectuated and consummated in his own person by Jesus Christ; in that the condition which the devil had brought about on the flesh and blood of man, and through this, on the soul of man, had been utterly removed, and a new and fresh constitution from the Holy Ghost had been acquired and affixed; and by consequence "the foundation" of a new manhood laid upon the earth, thereby rendering the work of the devil of *none effect*. And this is the very meaning of the word for "destroy" in the verse. That word means to *put down* or *make fruitless*, as when the

Digitized by Google

Apostle (using the same word) says "Shall their unbelief *make* the faith of God *without effect?*" The significancy of the text is well expressed by the Apostle John in these words: "the Son of God was manifested that He might *destroy the works* of the devil". We would say then that the true and literal rendering of the passage is that Christ "shared our flesh and blood, that through their death He might baffle or discomfit him that had the power of death, that is, the devil". The devil assuredly is discomfited and foiled if Christ undid and reversed the work which had been accomplished on man by the fall.

Here we may be called on to inquire more particularly as to the "work of the devil" on man. It is impossible for us fairly and fully to understand *the work of Christ* as the Destroyer of sin, and the Father of righteousness, unless we first ascertain and show what was the actual *work of the devil*, as the author of sin, and the father of lies. If, therefore, we are ever clearly to discern, and intelligently to appreciate, the counter-work of the Lord Jesus Christ, that is, His great atoning work, whereby "He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and which is called His "finished work," whereby the supremacy of Satan was overthrown, and the death-blow was given to Satan's power as lord of the world, we must first ascertain what precisely "the work of the devil" was, as entailing evil upon man; in short, what was in strictness the condition into which man was brought by the fall, as compared with the condition in which God made him and placed him in the paradise of Eden.

And first, what was the condition in which God created man? It is not enough in an inquiry of this

Digitized by Google

sort to say that man was created in a holy and happy estate. We must ascertain what was the precise complexion of his constitution—(1) what was it in fact that prompted in him obedience to the Divine Will? and (2) under what circumstances might there arise, and did there arise, in him a tendency to contravene that will? Man, as a denizen of the world, was the highest manifestation of animal nature upon the earth, the *ne plus ultra* of animal creation; and his mental attributes were without doubt made dependent on the instrumentality of brain with which he was endowed. On man had been bestowed the highest complexity conferred on any creature in this respect—(there is no question among physiologists as to this fact)—and as a consequence, the mind of man has presented itself as endowed with a correspondingly high function and power. We do not here enter on the question as to what forms the basis of conscious mind; that is, out of what medium we have understanding and consciousness developed: that subject has already been so far mooted in the Introduction to this work; but in referring the varying characteristic qualities of mind to brain, we would have it to be understood that we utterly eschew what is known as the dogma of materialism in order to the constitution of the soul. The averment that the faculties of the understanding are limited, graduated, determined, and characterised by the qualities and organisation of brain-instrumentality, does not, in our view, in the least interfere with the fact that understanding and consciousness are the outcome of spirit, having and holding as its inherent attribute the property of intellectualism. I shall take the opportunity of separately discussing the psychological problem; and therefore I content myself

Digitized by Google

here by stating my conviction, that not only are the foundations of the conscious *me* found in the representation developed in pure spirit from the bodily Ego, but that the ordinary capacities of mind depend on cerebral instrumentality.[1]

What has now to be noticed is the fact that the Creator has not only made man like all inferior animals, with a mind exactly reflecting the bodily structure (its qualities and disposition), and with faculties precisely corresponding with a given instrumentality; but that man, with all this, was gifted with an apprehension, through this instrumentality almost peculiar to himself, of the wants of the *not-me*, and with the power of reasoning on the same, and consequently of having moral reflections in connection therewith; while yet, strictly speaking, he was but thus far a creature of the flesh. When I say a creature of the flesh, it will be understood that I mean a creature not wrought upon by the Spirit of God, and therefore as not having acquired the express teaching of God; and it will not be understood that, as a creature of the flesh, I could indicate that the soul of man consisted of a medium of flesh; but what I mean is, that man born by ordinary generation has the prerogative of understanding and feeling moral obligations; although in the face of carnal impulses, the law of morals could have existed but as in an incipient condition; and the laws of the flesh, as such, would have been the prevailing laws or governing powers of his constitution.

It is not unlikely that what are spoken of in Genesis as the "giants that were on the earth in those days"—spoken of as "men," in distinction from "the Sons of

[1] See *Excursus*, XIII., On the psychological problem as to the formation and operation of souls.

Digitized by Google

God," were of this character, and that the creation of Adam was that ultimate stage of the divine procedure, in virtue of which God linked the things of heaven to the things of earth, and made the Spirit of God upon the soul of Adam, the regulating and controlling power of his being. In short, it needed the power of the Spirit of God on the soul to bring the moral intuitions into full, free, and adequate ascendency as the regulating and controlling power of the manhood. Hence we are to look upon Adam as one who, while he had the carnal impulse in his nature, had it so adjusted, as to be in subservience to the moral and spiritual impulse of his position; and consequently, that, while the carnal impulse was of necessity the directing and governing agent in *animal* creation hitherto—in man, constituted now as "the son of God," that carnal impulse was placed duly under the restraint of moral and spiritual authority, which moral and spiritual authority formed the law of God on the human soul.

The economy of man, then, as the final work of God upon the earth, was in beautiful and blessed harmony with God Himself. Our first parents had the characteristics of the tree which was in the midst of the garden pointed out to them: they saw the tree with all its attractive charms, and they were able to look with equanimity and calm indifference thereon. Their senses were appealed to, but any creation, that might have ordinarily arisen to touch it, or to taste of its fruits, was immediately subdued, in the knowledge that it was specially withheld from them. There was no disposition whatever to rebel, and no tendency on the part of the flesh to pant after it—to cherish a desire for it. The impression that the tree was forbidden to them, at

Digitized by Google

once deadened every craving that might no doubt ordinarily have arisen, had they been left entirely free to use it as they pleased. The whole soul-economy, then, of these immediate children of God was in full accord with the Author of their natures and the Director of their lives. A complex economy it was, very much so, in comparison with the animal natures that were established preliminary to man. In each of those, the natural disposition and character were but the reflex of the qualitative characteristics of the bodily living structure represented on the spirit-ground which belonged to the constitution of each, and there was no counteractive or controlling agency in their case; for the very emotion or craving was to them not only the foundation of will, but in point of fact, it was and is the manifestation of will in the irrational mind.

In man, however, as gifted with a rational nature, the situation was different, because the constitution was now essentially different. His will, like theirs, may properly enough be said to be grounded in the emotional nature; but emotions in his case did not always constitute will; for those emotions which proceeded from the purely carnal source, had in man to be met by others from a moral source; and as the moral emotion followed the physical, and invariably indicated what was for *the greatest good* of the creature, of course it behoved that the moral law should be, as a rule, the controlling and regulating arbiter of the life. This controlling and regulating arbiter of the life was, moreover, supplied with help, in that special instruction in all the cases when man would be in doubt, or when he might possibly fall into error, was duly supplied from the mouth of God Himself. The created condition of

Digitized by Google

man was thus one in which carnal cravings of necessity existed, but in which, also, the carnal cravings were kept in due check by the ascendency of moral law, and the spiritual authority of God's own word.

It is absolutely essential to the due comprehension of the peculiar case of man, to keep clearly in view the great fact, that *from the beginning there were antagonistic elements in man's constitution.* His nature had controlling emotions which the inferior creation had not. His nature was not the simplicity of their natures. Occasions might indeed be found when opposing emotions would arise in their case, as when fear controls and keeps at bay the impulse which seeks the satisfying of hunger; but in that case the stronger animal emotion for the time prevails; and man might be in a similar category. But what characterized man, as entirely distinguished from the lower animals, was the fact that he was endowed with a *moral* check to meet or to regulate the physical impulse; which check was placed as the guardian or sentinel of will—supported, moreover, in circumstances of need, by the general instructions of God. The moral check I have said is founded on, and springs out of, the gift of reason; that is, of reason having the privilege of apprehending the wants of the *not-me*; for if this apprehension were wanting, the range of human action must be very much contracted and curtailed.

This power of Intuition is a remarkable gift belonging to man. He has, like all other creatures which have the power of perception, the sense of the presence of an object; and like them, is able to apprehend how that object is capable of immediately affecting *himself;* but he has a far higher prerogative than this: he has, over

Digitized by Google

and above, that which belongs to the lower animals, a sense of the relation of the object to *others*, and of its applicability to *others*, and how it will affect these others. For example, if the object be a creature in want, he has the prerogative of apprehending this want in another, and through his reason, of providing for it. It is here that moral intuition and moral will have their extensive application and play. Man, unlike to irrational natures, can not only perceive immediate impressions as they can, through the channels of external sense, but he can at once also apprehend the consequences of adopting any action, which these immediate impressions may suggest; and this very apprehension of a consequence may instantly breed or beget an emotion, which may modify or stay the action which he would otherwise be induced to put in force. A man might be attracted by the beauty of a creature, or by the wants of a creature, and so lay hold of it to examine it more closely, or to minister to its necessities; but if he apprehended that it had a poisonous sting in its tail, or in its mouth, he would be cautious in touching it. Thus would the moral emotion which has respect to the protection and preservation of self, prevail. If a man were told that a certain dish would prove death to him if he were to partake of it, assuredly he would let it alone, however pleasurable to the taste, because life is dear to him: the desire of life being the strongest impulse of his nature. However attractive the dish might be, however sweet and delicious to the taste, still it would be unceremoniously set aside, because of his apprehension of the consequences attending the use of it. When man, therefore, in holding communion with his Maker, received a special schooling as to the effects of the forbidden tree, we can

Digitized by Google

understand with what emotional promptitude he would recoil from tasting, or even touching, its fruit.

Such was the created condition of man—a condition in thorough harmony with God, a condition in which there was an entire homage rendered to the will of God, and a ready compliance with the emotions of the moral law, because these emotions were invariably for the real well-being, and best estate of self. The created condition of man was one under which, in point of fact, he had two natures, the carnal and the moral, on which latter was engrafted the spiritual:—the carnal, having the source of its impulses and cravings in the bodily economy, with which he was endowed, supplied as these cravings were by the abundance of the world, which was given for the support and enjoyment of its life: the moral giving the duteous check, or imposing the righteous restraint, which the carnal impulses needed, and to which, therefore, they were subjected, in order to the supremacy of what is called Conscience, as the regent or vicegerent of God in the soul. Hence it is obvious that in the condition in which God had originally placed man upon the earth, man had *from the beginning* to maintain a disciplinary restraint over himself, that is, over his lower nature. All we say is, that he was fully qualified to do so. Such was his state of innocence. The reigning power of the moral law was so authoritatively established in his soul, at his creation by God, as to give him vantage ground over any and every inferior impulse, that might otherwise push itself for gratification, so that it might be restrained within its proper and allotted bounds.

Let me now come a little more to particulars. We have seen that, among other restrictions to which man

Digitized by Google

had to submit, in carrying out the behests of the higher nature, as one under the direct government of God, an immediate arrest was laid on his freedom, as regards the range of the garden in which he was placed. Beautiful and plentiful was the store of every necessity required by man for the sustenance and the true pleasure of life; but it was absolutely needful in order to prepare man for that immortality, which God had destined for him, that the lower nature should undergo self-denial, as absolutely yielding to all the behests of the Spirit. *Self-denial then was the very law of man's created state,*—that self-denial which consists in the complete submission of the carnal to the spiritual; and it behoved that man, who had been made capable of acquiring a body celestial, after having a body terrestrial, should subordinate his body terrestrial to the discipline of the Spirit. Hence the institution of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil". It was beautiful to the eye: it was attractive to the taste: it was spoken of as "the tree of knowledge,"—a tree therefore whose fruit would have this extraordinary property of enlarging the intelligence of man, a property therefore rendering it peculiarly desirable to look upon and taste: a tree prominent among others, as being *in the midst* of the garden, and therefore constantly before the eyes of our first parents; and yet they were prohibited from even touching it, upon the pain of death.

Here was a tangible subject of discipline,—such as was indispensable for our first parents; for without it their destiny could not be fulfilled. Here was a subject on which the authority of God had pronounced very decisively, submitting a clear criterion of obedience,—

Digitized by Google

as indispensable not merely to prove the divine supremacy in the heart of man; but as a test in order to shew the thorough prostration of the bodily or carnal nature as in absolute subjection to the Spirit. Such an elaboration had to be constituted for man, that a due discipline might be undergone by man, as the preparation for that eternal life, to which God had destined him, and of which He had made him capable. It was the apprenticeship for Heaven, which man had *from the first* to undergo. It imposed no real affliction upon man, because man had every proper indulgence provided for him; but it imposed the entire surrender of the flesh, and the absolute abnegation of the carnal self, in servility or subservience to the will of the spiritual self. Without this there could be no discipline of the flesh for a spiritual and eternal sphere.

It is of essential importance to note this, because it is only through this consideration that we are able to justify all the ways of God to man. The life of God must not only be *implanted* in the soul of man, but the life of God must *prevail* in the soul of man, in order to man's perfection for glory. If the flesh, as a law of operation in the soul, should in any case successfully oppose the law of the Spirit in the soul, in that case, the flesh would be found to have usurped a dominion in the soul, antagonistic to the celestial regime; and in consequence, the soul to that extent would be defiled. The soul that is prepared for the celestial state, is one that has been and is under the dominion of the Spirit, —one therefore that through the Spirit has ruled over the flesh,—one that has asserted its supremacy over the flesh,—one that has thus taken away from the flesh all tendency to dominate,—one which controls the flesh

Digitized by Google

as endowed with the power of energy on the soul,—one therefore which prepares the soul for the celestial sphere. We believe that the discipline implying such a rule on the part of the Spirit over the living body, was a discipline belonging to man's created condition. And seeing this, we not only see the possibility of man's fall, but even the danger of man falling, should the flesh at any time get the better of the Spirit. It was meet that the flesh then, which behoved to have its necessities fulfilled, should have its special provocations, where necessity did not exist, in order that the Spirit, overcoming on these occasions might shew the power of the higher law over the lower, and therefore that no risk of a fall might arise on such occasions.

The impulses of the flesh, if free and unrestrained, would of course instigate our first parents to eat of the fruit of the tree, which was in the midst of the garden; but our first parents were not free and unrestrained in this matter, because the higher law of unquestionable authority had imposed a curb upon them. Though attractive to the eye, and desirable to the taste, and moreover though an accessory inducement to partake of the fruit had been ascribed to it, as giving enlightenment and enlargement to the understanding; yet such was the definite control under which all the inferior desires of man were placed, in subjection to the commands of God, and to His spiritual rule, that when once the barrier was raised, man had no difficulty in obeying. Truly the life of God pervaded the soul of man and readily prevailed. Man was made to submit to such hindrances to the flesh, that he might be prepared for that immortality of which he was made capable, and in submission to such hindrances, man thus

Digitized by Google

made in perfect conformity to God, had in himself the reigning power of his created manhood.

The inquiry now arises, How did man come to fall? How could it happen that this reigning power of the Spirit should come to be dislodged? Why should not the law of the Spirit's rulership be maintained in its true dominion and freedom?[1] The question has been thought a very difficult one to answer,—so difficult as to savour of presumption where there is an attempt to answer it; but there is an answer, a clear and perfectly satisfactory answer, as one may dare to think. I have adverted to Satan's interposition by base and cunning and lying words; and if we carefully attend to what constitute the turning points of will, and to the recital of what took place, as recorded in the Bible, we shall find data on which sufficiently to explain the catastrophe of the fall. We have nothing to do here with the preliminary fall of Satan himself; that would take us out of our way to enter upon it; and what I say is that until Satan comes on the scene, there is not the least inclination on the part of man to break the commandments of God.[2]

And how did Satan operate to achieve the result of man's rebelling against God? His *first object was to unsettle the convictions grafted by God on the soul of man.* This is an all-important observation, and lies at the foundation; because it is only under convictions, inspired by impressions received from the Spirit of God, that the will in this case could be determined; and consequently it is only under such convictions, that the Spirit of God could exercise over the soul due authority

[1] See *Excursus*, XIV., On the question of Human Freedom.

[2] See *Excursus*, XV., On the Fall of Satan.

Digitized by Google

to rule and to repel the carnal nature. It is a recognised and indubitable fact, as touching the operations of mind, —a fact proved in every one's experience, that *emotions or motives, as the foundations of will, arise only from those ideas which, from the time, subsist in the mind;* and the devil knew well that, if he could but succeed in *removing for the time the conviction,* that the command to abstain from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, came from God; then the very check, which prevented them from partaking of that tree, would also be removed; and then also the inducements to eat thereof could be made sufficiently powerful to have their fulfilment. Accordingly his first and primary task was *to unfasten and detach from the soul the impression,* which the woman (to whom he addressed himself) had received, and which up to that moment remained in her mind, as a conviction planted by God, that she was actually prohibited from partaking of the fruit in question. He begins therefore cautiously, but confidently to question the accuracy of her impressions, and to hint that these impressions were delusions. "And he said unto the woman, Yea, *hath God said* ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden?" Not a word is said to question the supremacy of God,—not a word to lessen the reverence due to the command of God; in this he appears as standing in perfect harmony with the woman. He seems anxious rather to uphold the authority of God, and to admit the love of God to her and her husband, and therefore he is full of regard for her interests with God. His plan of approach therefore was calculated to deceive the woman, and to unhinge the belief she entertained, that she was in point of fact forbidden to eat. He comes to her as

Digitized by Google

one that had full knowledge of the circumstances,—as one that had the fear of God on himself,—as one that had a strong concern in her best well-being and happiness; he comes without a single word to intimate a case of danger,—without one word to depreciate the authority of God,—without one word that could alarm the soul,—not once hinting any violation of the Divine requirement, or that it would be but a small matter to violate the command of God, but rather with many words to betoken the necessity of a harmony with God and a solicitude for the honour of God, and the happiness of man. In short, Satan comes as "an angel of light"; and all the while he sets forth the fruit of this remarkable sin, as not only affording present gratification, but the foundation also of future elevation and honour. And now see, when once he had gained a hearing, with what assurance he gives forth his statements. "And the serpent said unto the woman, *ye shall not surely die;* for God doth know that in the day that ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil."

The scheme laid and adopted by Satan, succeeded. Nor is it difficult to apprehend *how* it succeeded. Nothing is more common in our experience than for a man to become *unhinged as to the truth of his convictions;* and this disengagement of an impression brings with it of course *an arrestment of its law of operation,* which it formerly exercised. Take an ingredient out of a mixture or combination, and the effect of that ingredient in the mixture no longer prevails. In like manner take away the impression from the precise category of mind, in which will is formed, and out of which the particular will in question arises, and the will no longer

Digitized by Google

exists. *This is universal as regards the laws of mind.* Remove a conviction, and you remove thereby the will which springs from that conviction. Once make a man to understand that his present impressions are erroneous, and that very moment you undo his course of action, as arising from said impressions. Any man, by carefully watching his own experiences, and by watching what he sees constantly taking place in others, can satisfactorily prove this statement for himself. Take the case of St. Paul. While he was Saul, cherishing the conviction that Christianity was an imposture, and having zeal for the honour of God, he did out of a sincere conscience, persecute the Church of Christ, and "haling men and women, committed them to prison"; but when Jesus Himself appeared to him in the skies, and informed him by evidences which left him no room to doubt that he had been mistaken in his convictions, and that Jesus was no impostor, his will as a persecutor was at the self same time stanched; and his course of action was immediately arrested. Again, the prophet of Judah resisted Jeroboam, by refusing to eat bread or to drink water in Bethel, so long as he retained on his mind the impression that Jehovah had commanded him not to do so; but when an old prophet (one acknowledged to be a prophet and supposed to have equal authority with himself) *took away this impression*, the man of God out of Judah altered his course, and becoming open to receive fresh impressions from the old prophet, took the way, that is the will, which these impressions begat. In short it comes to this, and I put it thus as a normal case:—*Tell me what are the present convictions of a man, and I will tell you the present will and conduct of the man.*

Digitized by Google

Is the fall of man therefore, after all, so very difficult a problem? Can we give no proper account of the process whereby it was achieved? Surely if we can explain how ideas are communicated to the mind: and again, how these ideas may be *removed* from the mind, as supposed to be false impressions which have been mistakenly entertained as true; and consequently removed from an authoritative place, and consequently an operative place in the soul, we can go a far way to explain the process of the fall. If it be at once admitted, as it must be, that *it is out of ideas communicated to the soul, and received by the soul as true, that we have will generated in connection with these ideas, and of course in the line of these ideas;* if it be admitted, as it must be, that will and volition are dependent on the characteristics of truth or of falsehood with which our ideas are received, then what may be called the philosophy of the fall is no longer a mystery, but a readily explicable and understandable fact.

It seems almost impertinent thus to pronounce so decidedly regarding what has always been regarded a mystery; but let the question be fairly tested,—let the doctrine of motives be fairly canvassed, let it be known that there is no such thing as will without a motive, and no such thing as motive without an idea: let it be known that motive is always an idea operating on the basis of the *me:* let it be known that a motive once entertained may be removed; then therewith the will which it imposed removed, and the process of the fall becomes simple, and can be satisfactorily explained. If the *a priori* philosophy did not create a stand-point which makes exposition an impossibility, if the *a posteriori* philosophy were carried out to its legitimate re-

Digitized by Google

sults, all would come forth in easy, simple naturalness; and the day is surely not far distant when the redemption of man, as well as the fall of man, will be established on principles which admit of scientific application, that, is of logical exposition—when difficulties about the foundations of will, and the laws of human freedom will be fully met and overcome,—when the interpositions of God will be seen and acknowledged, as in no sense disturbing that freedom,—when an accession to the truths of Scripture, and a help to the right interpretation of Scripture, will be obtained beyond any thing hitherto achieved. I cannot enter upon such questions now. All we can do is to point to the fact that *every true man is characterised by his convictions for the time being; and that convictions are a mobile element, retained in the mind, or dismissed from the mind, according as they retain or lose the characteristics of truth; and that the operation of will in the soul is roused or disabled accordingly.*

I shall have to point out what effect the communications of Satan had, and what it was, and is, that constitutes the precise evil which was fundamentally inflicted on man by the fall. We shall see that when once the spiritual elements, that came from God, were dislodged, and free and unfettered access was given to the carnal cravings to assert their dominion, that man thereby lost the image of God, and communion with God, and a taste for God, and harmony with God; and was of necessity without that original righteousness which was implanted by God; and that in short, man became what is called *flesh*, that is governed by carnal impulses. Let us be thankful that there is a way of regeneration by the provision of a second Adam, Who

Digitized by Google

hath overturned the work of the devil, and that through Him, man may once more become no longer "flesh," but "spirit".

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF HUMAN EVIL.

"Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."—HEB. ii. 4.

WE have seen that in order to undo the work of the devil on man, it behoved Jesus Christ to be made man, —that there being on the ordinary manhood a special work to do, that special work was given to Christ to do; and that in order to accomplish this work it behoved him first of all to partake our very flesh and blood. It must, therefore, be of enormous moment for the Church of Christ, that it should, on the one hand, ascertain and know what the work of the devil upon man really was, and what its character and effect upon man, on the other hand, really have been: in order, *first*, to see what is the evil with which man is now born,—whence it comes, and where it fundamentally lies; and, *second*, to see how and in what way Jesus met the evil, removed the evil, and remedied it as the mischief that had been done; and how He thereby made atonement to God, and rendered entire satisfaction to the justice of Heaven by so doing.

I have already inquired into the nature of Christ's

Digitized by Google

incarnation, and in so doing, I have sought to conclude according to the plain and simple teaching of sacred Scripture; throwing out of view all traditional preconceptions; and I have found that whatever, as a general rule, characterises the flesh and blood which presently belongs to man, must needs have characterised the flesh and blood of the living body of our blessed Lord. I say, as a general rule, because Christ representing the race, and not representing mere individuals, had nothing to do with the specialities with which this particular man and that particular man had brought into the world—nothing therefore to do with the distempers and diseases and peculiar ailments by which individuals of the race were disordered. And again, considering that ordinary man in the circumstances under which he is begotten, does in his soul delineate intellectually the precise conditions of the fleshly nature, so as to shadow these forth in the medium of mind, as things of consciousness, not having in himself (that is, in his soul) any Divine spirit as a regulating and controlling power, beyond the moral energy which may arise in connection with, and as the necessary result of, his rational nature; it behoved that the soul of the Lord Jesus Christ should, upon the self-same principles, be fairly representative of the bodily nature which He had assumed, with this very marked distinction betwixt Him and all other children born into the world, that the very ground on which that soul was formed happened to be also the possessor of the Divine impress, as the Son of God, in which case we understand what is meant by the expression "the Word made flesh".

The source and origin of souls have been already indicated as that which will best bear investigation, and gene-

Digitized by Google

rally correspond with facts and with the analogy of nature, while moreover, the characteristics of souls in regard to disposition, taste, and tendency are duly accounted for. And as it has been concluded that all souls are begotten naturally according to the organisation of the body; and this without in the least adopting the views of materialism as applicable to souls, so we must believe that the soul of the Lord Jesus was primarily born of the body which He received, with this farther distinction (a great one), that along therewith there was the impress of God, without any confusion or intermixture of the natures.

I have taken opportunity elsewhere of entering more fully into the discussion of this most interesting question of the soul's development from, and direct operation with, the material body, or, in other words, to discuss the great problem of psychology from a fresh point of view.[1] As regards the soul of Jesus, we must believe that it had to fight its way, as instructed and inspired by the plenary possession of the Spirit, not only against the world and against the devil, but against the flesh itself, which could only be through the Divine light He possessed, and which was obviously imparted as needs demanded. At all points the combat had to be encountered and maintained by Himself, as enlightened and instigated by the Divine Spirit, of which He was a partaker "without measure". In Jesus, then, we see a second Adam, with a body of flesh and blood

[1] See *Excursus* on the Psychological Problem, already referred to. I had intended to set forth a separate treatise on the great question of Matter and Spirit, the foundations of mind generally, and the principles which go to constitute the human mind in particular; but this must meanwhile stand in abeyance.

Digitized by Google

specially prepared for sacrifice, out of the substance of His mother, and having of necessity a soul manifesting the properties of that flesh and blood; yet over and above carrying in the background that which other and ordinary souls did not carry, the express seal, impress, stamp or lineament of the Divine Father.

We are thus brought face to face with the evil which our Lord came to drive away and exterminate. What that evil was I shall have particularly to examine. How that evil was brought about I have already inquired; and we have seen that it was through direct falsehood on the part of Satan, whereby the woman, being deceived, was seduced to give up certain spiritual convictions, and of course, therefore, to resile from the will and consequent obedience which these convictions engendered.

It has been asked, How could God permit His creature man to be so interfered with by a lying Spirit, and so endanger the fall of man, and thereby occasion the introduction of sin into our world, and all the consequent wickedness and war which have characterised it? Those who so ask have not contemplated sufficiently the very necessities of man's created condition in order to prepare him for immortality; and they have not contemplated sufficiently the thorough freedom in which it was needful for God to place man upon the earth. It was not the part of God to prevent angels from holding converse with man; and if good angels were allowed this freedom, it is difficult to see how wicked angels, who had freedom to rebel, should have their freedom arrested. It is perfectly obvious that it did not consist with the perfection of the Divine scheme to interpose the arm of the Lord, to come between His

Digitized by Google

rational creatures and the free exercise of the law of their being, which free exercise must needs constitute the ground of their responsibility, just as the ground of human responsibility lay in the free discharge of the duties made incumbent upon them.

It was enough for God to make His creature man capable of standing firm to the principles imparted to him, whatever interferences might take place, while the interferences themselves were in the circumstances unavoidable, and indeed were no doubt indispensable for the development of man's created condition to a fitness for installation into an immortal sphere. It cannot be said that a terrestrial state at any time was ever in itself an immortal sphere: on the contrary, it must be allowed that, from the beginning, a terrestrial state was essentially a mortal state, because a perishable state, and all the creatures up to man had been created essentially mortal and perishable, the distinction in respect of man being, that *by imparting to him the spirit of God, he thereby came into qualification for immortality.* The grounds of immortality are tolerably well defined in Scripture; and if "God alone hath immortality," it is obvious that man can have immortality only so far as he is begotten and born of God. That which gave the crowning gift of immortality to man was without doubt the impartation of the Divine Spirit,[1] and according as man was imbued with the Spirit of God, as the alone ruling power in his soul, so would he be prepared for the celestial state, as essentially the dwelling-place of God, and of the spirits of men made perfect.

Here it is that some theologians have overlooked an

[1] See *Excursus*, XVI., On the possession of the Holy Ghost.

Digitized by Google

essential feature in the scheme of God. They have spoken as if God made things at the beginning, and at once, with immediate and with *ultimate* perfection. It is tolerably evident that God made things upon the earth with the view of their coming under a process of training in order to *ultimate* perfection. The earth itself was not made at first, and at once, in that perfection to which it has ultimately come. Lengthened periods of time were required for its being a place of preparedness for man, with its bowels filled with the varied material essential for his necessities as the precious chief. The plants, as they came to be developed in their indefinite varieties, were not made in that perfection to which they have become attainable by means of cultivation. The animals too have become diversified through climate and food and discipline; and especially those which have come under the immediate control of man have been improved by careful breeding. Nor was it to be supposed that man himself must be a fixed and finished star at once, set up with all the illumination he had to expect, and no progress before him in order to the manifestation of those higher qualities of which he was peculiarly susceptible. Such assuredly was not the created state of man. On the contrary, as man had been made with higher powers than had been granted to the other creatures of the earth, it was naturally to be anticipated that he would have room and scope for a far wider and loftier development than the inferior animals.

And who really doubts the fact? One of the peculiar interests attachable to man's condition, is the constant process of discovery on which he is entering, and the consequent acquisition of new privileges to which he is

Digitized by Google

attaining, through the fresh discoveries of truth. These experiences are happening now; and it cannot be doubted that they were experiences which touched man at the beginning,—experiences through which it was needful that man should pass, in order to that elevation to which he is destined in preparation for a new dispensation beyond this world.

When, therefore, we are enabled to obtain a somewhat expansive grasp of the Divine plan in the creation of the world, and of the forethought of God in the ultimate completion, according to that plan, of the world in all its beauty and grandeur and solidity,—points not attainable otherwise than through the intermediate contention and settlement of antagonistic elements, which, in so complex a system, must needs come into collision; and when we contemplate therewith the determination to set up a second Adam, who should absolutely and effectually carry out the Divine will, by a self-denying obedience, even as God demanded that the Divine will should be carried out, by the first Adam; and that the second Adam should meet all the evils coming upon the world, through the fall of the first Adam, we cannot wonder that Satan should be allowed to do his utmost and his worst, without any express interposition on the part of God to prevent him. Accordingly we find that Satan consorted with our first parents, and by direct deceit yet plausible pretence, he caused, 1st, that *they should dismiss from their minds the impression*, which they had received of the Divine command—that they should regard that impression as a delusion; and in order that they might the more readily regard it as a delusion, Satan led them, 2nd, to consider the qualities of the tree (which were so likely to gratify and benefit them), and

Digitized by Google

the love of God, who was so desirous to indulge and to benefit them. This was an artful stroke: it inserted the small end of his wedge. They were well assured of the love of God, and they properly held the belief that God would withhold nothing that was really for their good.

This then was the moment to push forward the qualities of the tree, as essentially serviceable in this respect. Now what was this, but in point of fact pushing forward into prominent activity those carnal desires, which a particular attention to the alleged qualities of the forbidden fruit was calculated to engender and stir up? In simple terms, and as the result of his cunning representations, whereby the forbidden fruit was dressed up with peculiar attractions, *Satan* (as I have shewn) *managed to take away the very check which God had implanted in the soul, and by which alone man was restrained from committing sin*—a process common enough and understandable enough in our own personal experiences; that is, he removed the very restraint, which the Holy Spirit imposed upon the soul of man: the word sown by God in his heart was stolen away; and another and very different impress was ingrafted on his heart. This obviously explains the process of the fall.

Is it necessary here to enter upon the process by which the human mind operates in the formation of its will? This has been already so far discussed, and we cannot call in question patent facts. The soul is properly a spirit-individuality as a *me*, founded on the material conditions of the body. This *me* comes to receive impressions through the senses, and when the impressions go as ideas to the me, they affect the me variously, according to the qualities which belong to them; and hereby emotions are created,

Digitized by Google

out of which emotions will naturally springs. But when a *direct idea* ab extra prompts an emotion to will, there is immediately presented a foresight of the consequences; and this very foresight, which I may call the *indirect idea*, creates another emotion, which may operate as an *ought not* or moral check upon the emotion arising from the direct idea; more especially if the consequences foreseen are not desirable. That God communicated His will through the medium of the external senses to man we think is likely enough, and coming as these would with the direct authority of God, such communications would touch the soul with something like an absolute command, that may not for a moment be questioned; and obedience would therefore follow as a thing of course, and so it has to be said that the impress of the Holy Spirit was thus grafted on the soul of man. We know in what way the Holy Spirit is now engrafted on our souls. Is it not by the communications of God out of His revealed word, and hence the value of a preached gospel? There can be no doubt that the stamp of the Spirit of God had been impressed on the soul of our first parents with reference to the tree in the midst of the garden.

How came the divine impression to be removed? I have answered that question. Till this impression was effaced Satan could achieve nothing. So long as the impress of God remained on them, they could not sin; so long as the divine frame of mind, which God had established in man continued, holy emotions in harmony with God could alone arise; and the divine authority, as the law of man's spiritual integrity, must be maintained without fail: the prime object of Satan, therefore, was to remove this barrier to his success. Could this check to

Digitized by Google

Satan but be taken out of the way, he would find no difficulty in introducing an impression from the flesh which would carry out all his desire. There would in that case be nothing to hinder man from falling; on the contrary, he *would fall with as great ease and freedom to the current impulses of his soul, as in the former case he would have stood firm and fast to the teaching of God.*

We have seen by what process Satan managed to get rid of the obstruction to his success. Where then was the blame attachable to our first parents? Having once had the assurance, that God Himself had given them a plain and a positive command, they ought to have cherished and maintained that command always, till *God Himself* should appear and undo the restriction which Himself had imposed. This was the way of the Second Adam. God had brought Him into a situation, where no food was to be obtained, and at the same time let Him suffer the pangs of a craving hunger; and in these very circumstances, God permitted Satan to take advantage of this craving in a lonely place, and to urge Him to serve Himself, as the Son of God was entitled to do. But Christ, however much pressed by the impulses of the flesh to relieve Himself from the hankering of a keen and unsated appetite, resolved to wait for the *same God* to take Him out of His difficulty Who had brought Him into it; and He would adopt no measures for His alimentation, which God had not prescribed. The same thoughtful firmness, however, was not found in our first parents. They came to entertain the idea, that the conviction of God's having restricted them from the tree which was in the midst of the garden, might be a mistaken notion of their own, and therefore they per-

Digitized by Google

mitted that conviction to be dislodged from its place in the heart; and being once dislodged, it of course immediately lost its power in the soul; hence the impress from the flesh, that was urged by Satan, pushing its way for indulgence, and there being now nothing to restrain it, man gave way thereto; and so the carnal element obtained the ascendency in the heart; and this through the discharge of the spiritual element. This leads me for a little to consider *the nature of that evil* into which this act of disobedience brought man.

Man, by the fall, was, as we have seen, now no longer in the condition in which God had made him, and placed him. *God had made him, submitting to the rule of the Spirit, and restraining the flesh; man was now in the condition of being ruled by the flesh, and the Spirit was thrown off and removed.* God's word no longer held sway in the soul; hence the soul became open to the carnal part, and the carnal part held sway; and hence the balance-spring of the machine was quite altered. The clock-work which the Lord had established, would no longer move in the appointed harmony of human action, which He had ordained, because another influence with no true regulative power, now bore constantly upon the soul, and another administrator with its dicta was permitted to interpose, different from God, and alien to God. The consequence was, as regards the heart of man, that a set of affections sprung up in his bosom, which God had never planted, and which never could have emanated from the Spirit of God; and the mind of man became utterly changed in its tastes and tendencies. His tastes and tendencies became purely carnal; and cravings, that without difficulty would have been repressed and kept in due subordination, under

Digitized by Google

the government of the Spirit, were now allowed to run riot, and to have their indulgence in excess, and thereby they became so strengthened as to insist on gratification, even when that gratification interfered with the freedom and the rights and the prerogatives of others; and hereby a fresh swarm of selfish, base and hateful villanies sprung up from this root of carnal self-love, as man progressed in his indulgence of one excess after another; and in going from one extreme to another.

True it is, that man had still the foundations of moral law. That was inevitable, so long as man was gifted with a rational nature, capable of seeing the wants and requirements of others, as well as of those of self. The fall did not take man out of the field of morals, but it sadly contaminated the field of morals.[1] The reason of this is obvious enough, when we consider that *sound morals are dependent on a clear and correct understanding of the truth*, with a sound judgment. Moral law is one thing, and sound moral law is another. Moral law we shall find in the savage, as well as in the civilised man; but in either case, the moral law may possibly be at variance with the truth of God. Some have thought that conscience is a special faculty superinduced upon the human soul by God; and that its special function is to give forth the *dicta* of God; and they have been confounded, that in these circumstances it should speak so differently in different persons. But this idea is a mistake; conscience is of necessity graduated and defined and proportioned by the kind of intelligence we may happen to possess. I cannot discuss this question here; but I may say this much,

[1] See *Excursus*, XVII., On the processes of mental operation, and on the ground and source of moral law.

Digitized by Google

that if we have acquired *false* intelligence, a false moral law will proceed from that intelligence, as the conscience in us for the time being; and if we have acquired *correct* information respecting any object, the moral law arising out of that correct information, will be sound accordingly; that is, if the mind be true and honest to itself, and not warped and perverted by other and intruding persuasions.

If I am asked to say what is *moral discernment*, I should answer: *it is the apprehension of good or of evil, as the result of the action of any natural impulse, affecting either self or another, that is, affecting any creature susceptible of pleasure or of pain;* and *moral law is the emotion which arises under this apprehension.* There is a natural impulse to give a hungry dog food; it is moral discernment to foresee that a certain kind of food will injure him; it is moral law to check the impulse to give him injurious food, and to favour the impulse to give him wholesome food. A savage monarch feels he has offended his deity, and he has a natural impulse to appease him; and as he has been taught that a human victim will accomplish this, so he gives orders accordingly; but if the victim chosen should be one of the most useful of his own servants, he has moral discernment to see that such a victim would be inflicting an unnecessary evil on himself, and it is his moral law in accordance with that apprehension to choose another victim. There is a natural impulse to free a beloved relative from pain, and if I have been led to believe that a certain sacrifice on my part will deliver him from his prison, moral law demands the sacrifice of me. But if meanwhile, I am taught that the sacrifice will be of no avail to serve this end, the

Digitized by Google

emotion to make the sacrifice is annihilated. I may have a natural impulse to take the warder of the prison out of the way, but I have moral discernment to see the impropriety of this; and it is moral law to check this impulse. It is rational discernment for me to see the value of another man's vineyard as an object very desirable for me, and I may have the impulse to put the owner to death in order to secure it: it is moral discernment to see the consequences of carrying this natural desire into execution, and it is moral law to impose a check upon this desire. It would be a contradiction of all the promptings of moral law to slay the owner in order to become the possessor of the vineyard. In this case a man is not true to the law of his moral discernment; he has become the mere slave of natural desire. The law of all moral discernment is, while seeking our own good by fair means, to have a care against injuring others; in short, not to disturb the well-being, but rather to promote the well-being, of the object affected.

The sin of man, therefore, in its foundation, lies in permitting a selfish craving to prevail, so as to disregard the rights, the claims, the good of another, in short, to injure another for the sake of his own personal gratification. It would be equally an offence against moral law, if we are found to injure ourselves for the sake of indulging some present gratification. It is moral discernment, if I see that the partaking of a certain dish will injure me, it is moral law, therefore, to abstain from that dish; and it is a violation of moral law if, for the sake of a little temporary gratification of appetite, I go in for it, and take my fill of it, and so take the risk of injury to my constitution thereby.

Digitized by Google

Now consider for a moment the condition of man as a fallen creature. Man though fallen, had, as we have seen, his moral discernments; and as a rule, he ought to have the law of these discernments, that is, the kind of conscience prescribed by these discernments. The moral discernments may be true or false, and the verdict which conscience gives forth will be true or false accordingly; but how often is it, that man has not strength to act upon them. Why is this? Because he is pressed by some selfish passion or affection which blinds, that is, shuts out, a free and a full discernment, and blunts a free operation of emotion, as created by the discernment.

You can understand, then, how the law of carnal selfishness is the root of all our earthly evil. That law has its foundation in what is called "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life"; and that law, because of its imperative and exacting nature, doth in fallen and unregenerate man bear down every other, notwithstanding moral hindrances. "The lust of the flesh" is but a general term for the *carnal appetites;* "the lust of the eye" is but a general term for *those desires* which arise through the communications which are made by means of the *external senses* (æsthetic sins); and "the pride of life" is but a general term for those *aspirations after the honours and distinctions of the world* which observation and experience show to be its highest gifts (sins of ambition). All have their foundation in the carnal man. When these appetites or desires or aspirations, therefore, become the dominant powers of our nature, true morals, or shall I say sound morals, become little better than an empty name. Sound morals demand that no sensitive creature should be unnecessarily injured, but rather that its proper well-

Digitized by Google

being or real good (so far as known) should be considered and promoted. But what are the facts everywhere prevalent in a sin-smitten world? They are comprehended in this, that the reigning law of the carnal man, in some department or another, which happens chiefly to beset the individual, coerces in behalf of itself every other law that runs counter to this predominating disposition of self, and in proportion as it becomes strong, every other opposing law becomes weak. The consequence has been in the history of mankind, that might has much usurped the place of right. The plain English of this is, that while moral discernment pointed out that others had certain rights as well as self, yet that the rights of others had not been left freely to assert their claims, because self, with its pressing cravings being in the ascendant, would have its own impulses indulged even though at the expense of others. There was no real check in the soul of fallen man to restrain its own overpowering momentum in him for indulgence and enjoyment, whether in order to pleasure, or to possession, or to precedence.[1]

What has been the consequence? The world, instead of its being an arena of peace, has been a theatre of war —instead of being a kingdom of harmony and love, it has been more like a pandemonium of unclean spirits. Oppression and tyranny and bloodshed have characterised the generations of men; and all, through that self-seeking, aggrandizing acquisitiveness, which has its foundation in the flesh, and which, when carried into excess breeds falsehood, cunning, hypocrisy and other deceits, in order to the attainment of the desired object. False-

[1] See *Excursus*, XVIII., On man as created, man as fallen, and man as restored.

Digitized by Google

hood is the refuge of the carnal; and when falsehood becomes prevalent, the whole moral economy of a man is in grossest disorder, because in that case man becomes not merely the creature of the flesh, but becomes allied to the condition of unclean spirits.[1]

Such a world, as matter of course, is alienated from God. Men in these circumstances can have no true communion with God. The law of God, as running counter to their propensity, is hateful to them, and they stand aloof from it: they do not wish to have God in all their thoughts, because the check which God would interpose is death to their carnal life: it is death to the flesh as an operative power on the soul, and as being their abounding and favoured life therein.[2] Their life indeed is described in brief terms as "the life of the flesh". This life is the conscious animation of the carnal man in full and unrestrained sway. Its law says, "What shall I eat? What shall I drink? What shall I put on? What shall I aspire to in the world? What are my appetites, and what indulgence of them shall I seek after?" It is the law of carnal self throughout.

True it is, that the carnal self cannot be utterly neglected: there is a limited regard absolutely needed for its maintenance in the world, for its proper strength and wellbeing in the world, for the due prosecution of the duties of the world, and for the provision needful for our family-welfare in the world. Such things cannot with propriety be neglected; but there is a limit imposed, that limit which a free moral and spiritual intelligence is alone able to discern and decide upon.

[1] See *Excursus*, XIX., On the condition of Unclean Spirits, and the sin against the Holy Ghost.

[2] See *Excursus*, XX., On the Process which leads to Regeneration.

Digitized by Google

When the Spirit is wanting however (and it cannot but be wanting where the carnal element dominates), there is in some department or another of the flesh an absorbing and prevailing tendency, often running into excess, which in that case, for selfish ends, winks at the claims of others, and disregards the sufferings of others —which crushes and oppresses others, and as I have said, is attended with deceit and malignity and revenge, according to the feelings which may happen to be stirred up by the retaliation or other special kind of opposition, that may be presented when our selfishness is thwarted.

It needs no one to say that this condition of mankind has been sadly derogatory to the honour and glory of God. It betokens a state of man wholly offensive unto God, because it is alien to the condition which God introduced, and in direct inconsistency with the pure and holy atmosphere of Spirit-life in Heaven for which man has to prepare; and as you may suppose, nothing could satisfy God but a removal of the offensive condition, and a re-instatement or re-instalment of man, with the divine check re-imposed on his soul, that check coming from the Holy Spirit, by Whom alone man is enabled to deny himself unto sin, and to carry himself according to the law of righteousness.

Now, what constitutes the reversal of man's fallen condition, that is *the removal of the offence*, and *the introduction of the spirit of righteousness? What constitutes restoration*, so that man's condition comes to be changed from that of a sinful nature to a sanctified nature? What but *Atonement!* The very essence of Atonement implies this change. So long as no change has been made, it must be inferred that no atonement has been made. We cannot do better than go to

Digitized by Google

Scripture for the definition of Atonement. There it is termed "the putting away of sin". That indeed is not atonement in all its completeness, but it is atonement in all its fundamentals. If sin is not put away, nothing in the way of atonement can be effected. The putting away of sin is the very *first* part of the process in the fulfilment of atonement. Sin is the offensive thing before God; and it is the introduction of sin on the soul of man which has made man offensive unto God: the taking away of sin, then, is the taking away of the offence, for it is the taking away of that which makes man offensive to God. True it is, as I have said, that this taking away of sin is not atonement in all its completeness, for man needs something over and above the removal of sin, because the removal of sin simply would leave man only in a negative condition, and would fail to place man in the positive condition in which he originally stood before the fall. In addition to the abolishment of sin *from* his soul, man requires the inbringing of righteousness *upon* his soul, in which case he stands before God as a regenerated creature, no longer a sinner but a righteous one. Such a one God cannot deny: such a one must needs stand acceptable to God: such a one has all the qualities demanded by God: such a one has the image of God impressed upon his heart: such a one is not stained by the presence of sin upon his soul. God therefore can take such a one into His bosom: glorification awaits such a one: salvation from God belongs to such a one.

It is of enormous moment to have a clear and distinct conception as to what Atonement is. By atonement, two parties, who were once at variance, come to be reconciled. Hence the word atone (a compound word

Digitized by Google

which may be pronounced in its separate parts), means *at-one*. God and man under atonement are brought to be at-one: they are brought into harmony: man comes to be in agreement with God: the peace that had been broken has come to be restored; and the ground of this agreement and peace lies in the removal of the offence, and in the inbringing of satisfaction—satisfaction to Him who had reason to be offended. Such I hold are fundamentally the principles of atonement.[1]

These principles must be understood and apprehended, before we can duly discuss the question of atonement, we must have a rational idea of atonement: what it really is, before we can discuss the process of atonement—an idea which commends itself to our common intelligence, otherwise it is folly, it is worse than folly, to enter upon the question. How can a man pronounce judgment on that of which he can form no proper conception? There can be no meaning to us in the word atonement, if we can give no definition of the term; but if we have a precise and accurate significancy of the word in our own experience, and as applicable to our relative condition as between man and man in the world, it is that very significancy which we hope to find in the Scriptures; and on finding it, the question commends itself to our reason; and we have no help but to accept it as a scheme which cannot in reason be gainsaid. It is only in these circumstances that we shall ever be able to justify the ways of God to man.

We have seen then, what is the condition of fallen man: we have seen this as in contrast with the condition of created man: we cannot truly enter into and appre-

[1] See *Excursus*, XXI., On the principles which go to constitute Atonement.

Digitized by Google

hend the condition which constitutes a fallen nature, unless we are able to understand what was the condition of the created nature: I have compared these conditions: I have found that in creation, *the Spirit constituted the ruling power*—that is, man was constituted in thorough and complete obedience to God, as planting His principles in man; and that in this created state, there was no dominion on the part of the flesh in opposition to the Spirit; in short, that the flesh held a subordinate position, as regards the soul, in that the wants of the body had to be supplied under due deference to the behests of the Spirit, as the ruling and directing power in the soul. Such was the condition of what is called a *state of innocence*—a state which contained a divine check upon those impulses, which came upon the soul from the lower nature; that is, from the carnal nature of man. In this state all the outlets of the flesh were duly controlled, as it was absolutely indispensable that they should be controlled; for otherwise, it would have been impossible that the Spirit of God should reign supreme, and that the whole economy of the manhood could be in due subserviency to the law of the Lord.

Again, as to the *fallen* condition I have found that it essentially *consists in the dominion of the flesh over the soul and the absence of the Spirit as a ruling power in the soul;* and consequently, that in the fallen condition, that check is wanting which constitutes the divine regulator in the soul; and hence the soul without this must needs go wrong. We have seen that though, in virtue of our rational nature, we must needs have moral discernment, and that through moral discernment, we must needs have moral law, and moral law in precise conformity to our moral discernment; yet in as far as our

Digitized by Google

moral discernment is often false and generally imperfect, the moral law of our nature, displayed in what is termed conscience, must at best be inadequate and often utterly corrupt, while the power and pertinacity of the flesh, left to its own unbridled sway, would brow-beat any opposition that might generally be offered on the moral side. Thus would moral law (defective at its best), be altogether useless as an effective check on sin. It is utterly unable, even when purified by a clear discernment of the truth, to stay that power of carnal life, which, like an avalanche in its energy, carries those imperious demands (called by the apostle, ἀρχαι καὶ ἐξουσιαι, Col. ii. 15), which admit of no denial. The fallen condition in man is properly termed "the life of the flesh," that is, the dominion of the carnal impulse in the soul; and stands in contrast with the created and original condition of man, which is designated "the life of the Spirit".

The process then, which takes away the life of the flesh from the soul, and restores to the soul the life of the Spirit,—a process which constitutes Regeneration, is in fact, the process whereby atonement is made to God; and this I am prepared to show is *the application of the redemption purchased by Christ.* I have already spoken of Christ and of Christ's works, and of the *application* of it to us whereby we are made partakers of what He procured, and I may have occasion yet farther so to do; but before we could fairly understand this theme, it behoved us to know what is the sinful condition into which the fall brought mankind, and what changes were essential to be wrought on man before he can be brought into a condition of acceptance

Digitized by Google

with God, that is in order to the restoration of man to his original condition before the Lord.

Some are not contented with the statement that the carnal state of the soul constitutes the sinfulness of that estate into which the fall brought mankind; and they will have man, as fallen, to be carried into the self-same category with devils themselves. Man may, under the Christian dispensation be brought through evil agency into the same category with devils, but that is not essentially and fundamentally a description of man's natural state as a fallen creature. The Scriptures indicate what is man's fallen state, when they speak of him as being "in the flesh," and as "walking after the flesh"; and also when they tell us that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God". But this is fundamentally a condition very distinct and different from the condition of fallen angels, who are described in the Scriptures as "unclean spirits".

And what do we mean by "unclean spirits"? I answer spirits who have been instructed in divine truth, in divine requirements, in divine laws, and *who have perverted these laws*,—who have knowingly changed the truth of God into a lie,—who have perverted the word of the Lord into a meaning which it does not bear, and who have done this overtly and deliberately. The sin of unclean spirits is synonymous with the sin against the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost gives Himself to angels,—conveys the mind of God to angels; and angels were equipped from the beginning with the mind of God, and they had therefore the righteousness of God imparted to them, as the great prerogative of their condition. They had the simplicity of the spiritual nature, and for them to sin was at once to run directly counter

Digitized by Google

to God: for them to sin, therefore, was to "sin against the Holy Ghost"; and their sin is emphatically that which designates them "unclean spirits". It is the very perversion of the Spirit of God as applied to them: it is the retroversion or introversion of the divine mind in them, or if I may dare express it, it is the placing of the mind of God in opposition to itself, as if the polarity of the truth which essentially belongs to God were inverted. Such is the condition of Satan, and of the rebel angels: but such is not the condition of man as introduced by the mere fact of the fall. The position of man by the fall was fundamentally *the loss of the Spirit* on the soul, and the consequent *inroad of the flesh* upon the soul. By the loss of the Spirit, man lost communion with God, and being no longer the creature of the Spirit, man came under the wrath and curse of God without any other hope than that he should absolutely perish. But the devils could not absolutely perish, nor can any creature endued with the teaching of the Holy Spirit. "The Spirit giveth life" to the soul. God "alone hath immortality"; and to whom the Spirit giveth life, even he shall live everlastingly.

Man, therefore, was capable of the sin against the Holy Ghost, in the fact that if he became a receiver of the Holy Ghost, he might then become a perverter of the things which he thus received. The Pharisees committed this sin when they received from Christ the revealments of Heaven as to His true character, as a God-honouring prophet, and as the Son of God working for God, and in harmony with God,—when they said that Christ had a devil, and that He "cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils". Nothing could be more foreign to the truth, more glaringly contradictory

Digitized by Google

of the doings and sayings of Christ, and therefore more in teeth of the revealments of Heaven. Theirs, then, was the sin of devils, the sin which admits of no forgiveness, because it indicates a spirit of direct and bare-faced and perverted antagonism to God. Man, therefore, may come into the category of devils; but such is not the simply fallen state of man strictly and essentially. Even the sin of which the crucifiers of our Lord were guilty, great as that sin was, as applicable to those who were instrumental in accomplishing it, was far from being the sin against the Holy Ghost. Theirs was a forgiveable sin, on the ground of their ignorance in the perpetrating of it; for our Lord prayed upon the cross —"Father, forgive them"; and He adds the ground on which alone forgiveness was possible—"for they know not what they do".

We do not here enter upon the principles out of which the fall of angels took place: this question does not lie in our way. It is enough for us to know that it was a direct declinature of submission to certain requirements of God. It would appear that in their case, as well as in man's case, discipline in their created condition, in order to the due maintenance of their created condition, and the full development of their created condition, to the fixity and perfection destined for it, was absolutely necessary for angels as well as for man; and that when certain angels had been required to fulfil certain offices, they had felt that this requirement was beneath their exalted station, and hence out of pride they fell—pride manifested out of such requirement; just as sin was manifested by man out of the divine inhibition to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge, so the fall of angels would seem to have taken place.

Digitized by Google

And the fall of angels has been of that character, that we hear of no divine interposition to come between these angels and the retribution which naturally awaits them. They fell by their own unaided will under the demands of divine authority, and if in any future dispensation, they should ever return, it must in their case be a return by their own unaided will under divine dealing with them. Theirs is already the possession of the Spirit, and their condition is the perversion of the Spirit: the Holy Spirit therefore cannot help them; for they received the Holy Spirit, and they have perverted this into an evil spirit. It may be in the economy of God in coming dispensations, that under the distresses to which wicked angels shall be reduced, there will come to be an introversion of their present perverted state, and so the triumph of God over all that is evil shall be ultimately complete; but we have good authority for saying that "the sin against the Holy Ghost hath not forgiveness either in this world or in that which is to come," that is in the present or in the coming dispensation. It could not be, so long as their perverted condition remains.

The coming of Christ, then, in that He came in the flesh to overcome the sin of the flesh, had no reference to the sin of fallen angels, or to the sin against the Holy Ghost, as it might come to be committed by man. The coming of Christ had direct reference to the fall of man, as thereby becoming carnal after being spiritual; and hence the absolute necessity of the Incarnation. The Incarnation touched, and could alone touch, that peculiar condition of sinfulness into which man fell, when our first parents ate the forbidden fruit, because the Incarnation afforded a case, a very marked case, in which the flesh had been brought to a stand, and kept at bay,—

Digitized by Google

in which its current was stanched, and its life was sold, under the superintending and reigning power of the Spirit. I shall inquire into this more minutely in the next chapter which I have to submit on this great subject; and if we find that the death of Christ was the death of the flesh, and that the life of Christ was the supremacy of the Spirit, that is the life of the soul spiritually, as having and holding the Spirit of God in perfect fullness, then shall we come more clearly to apprehend what it is to have "the application of the redemption purchased by Christ," then shall we be no longer in perplexity as to what Christ means, when He tells us that we must be partakers of His body and blood, nay that we must eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, in order to have His life; and without which we cannot have spiritual life in us.[1] In short we must be baptised with the baptism of Christ, we must partake of His experiences: we must eat the meat which He ate, and drink the cup which He drank: we must be made "conformable to His death," that we may become partakers of His life. The blood is the life, and His body is now permanently established in living glory, because penetrated by that life; and if we are partakers of that life, we too shall live with Him, and be heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, in the possession of glorified natures and of the eternal inheritance of Heaven.

We should proceed now to see in what way Christ actually met the case of sinful man, so as to undo the ruin caused by the fall, and thereby to destroy the work of the devil, and therefore to discomfit the aims

[1] See *Excursus*, XXII., On eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ.

Digitized by Google

of the devil, and to blast the prospects of the devil. This will form the subject of the next chapter. In the meantime let us consider how far we are naturally from full agreement with God, and how distant yet from the goal of true regeneration; and consequently let us note the danger in which we still do stand, so far as we are the slaves of the flesh. If the flesh is the dominating power in our souls, then we are not redeemed from sin, because our natural sin lies in, and springs from, the flesh: for if we are in the flesh, then we cannot be in the Spirit, and we cannot walk as we are required to do, after the Spirit.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

THE WORK OF CHRIST DESTROYING THE WORK OF THE DEVIL.

"Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise partook of the same, that through death He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is the devil."—HEB. ii. 14.

I HAVE endeavoured to prepare the way for discussing the particulars which show the discomfiture of Satan by the death of Christ. As regards this point, let us observe over what ground we have travelled. I have taken up the subject of the *incarnation* of Christ, and have seen that whatever happened to be the flesh and blood of the children of Israel, and consequently of man, the same was the flesh and blood of the body of the Lord Jesus: *second*, I have considered the *liabilities* to which flesh and blood must needs be exposed: *third*, I have considered *the work which the devil effected* upon the body and the soul of man, and how this involved two grand inquiries—one touching *the process whereby the devil secured his end*, the other touching *the nature and effect of the evil which he had entailed on man.* What I have now to expound is, *how the work of the devil came to be destroyed by the death of Christ, i.e.*, how thereby the scheme of Satan comes to be brought to nought, and Satan thereby to be utterly discomfited.

Digitized by Google

Were I to treat this grand theme after a certain fashion, by cutting the gordian knot instead of untying it, the task would be an easy one; but to demonstrate the fact, and the process of its accomplishment, as a scientific problem, having something like mathematical certainty—at all events, logical consistency and harmony with ascertained facts—accompanying its details and its conclusion, can hardly be said to be an easy undertaking. You may ask, What constitutes the difficulty? The difficulty, it may be said preliminarily, lies in certain unscientific conclusions which have been formed respecting the redemption effected by Christ, and which, of course, especially on a subject like this, are not easily eradicated, when they have been once unreservedly entertained. I refer particularly to the doctrine of *Substitution*, so readily received, and so commonly proclaimed. Here is a curious fact or feature of the existing state of things, *viz.*, that most widely, if not most implicitly also, the dogma of the substitution of our blessed Lord for us is disseminated in the churches as a doctrine, and it is thought by not a few, an unquestioned, if not also unquestionable doctrine, of the Church of Scotland, and yet I aver it is not so.[1] I am prepared to show it is not unreservedly so. If "substitution," in its proper meaning, were meant, how could the Church speak of "the *application* to us of the redemption purchased by Christ"? It may be said that "the substitution of Christ in our room and stead as the sacrifice to God for us," did not and could not dispense with the application of Christ to us, because by *the application of Christ to us* we are sanctified, while by *the substitution of Christ for us* we are justified!

[1] See *Excursus*, XXIII., On the doctrine of Substitution.

Digitized by Google

What follows from this? Why, in the first place, that we were justified when Christ died on the Cross at Calvary; and therefore justified before we were born; and therefore it follows in the very teeth of our Churches' teaching, that we were justified without faith, and apart from faith, and apart from the possibility of faith: and in the second place, that, instead of justification and sanctification being inseparable, as our Church proclaims, there must be a very wide and distinct interval betwixt them!

But this is not all. Everyone knows, who knows anything of the principles of our Church, that "Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification, and the several benefits which do accompany or flow from them," are expressly said to arise from, and to be included in, our "effectual calling". Now, what is effectual calling? You are all familiar with the answer given in our Shorter Catechism. The answer given is as follows: "Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, He doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ as He is freely offered to us in the gospel". And farther, it is added—"They that are effectually called, do in this life partake of Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification, and the several benefits which in this life do either accompany or flow from them". Here it is very plainly intimated that effectual calling is the work of God's Holy Spirit upon our souls; and that said work consists—*first*, in the conviction wrought by the Holy Ghost upon our minds, that we are sinners, and that misery is the consequence of sin; *second*, in the light communicated to our minds respecting Jesus Christ,

Digitized by Google

respecting His person, respecting His office, respecting His work, and respecting the effects of that work; *third*, in the renewal of our own wills whereby, from having a natural taste and tendency towards sin, we become changed, or as it is expressed, "renewed," into a taste and tendency towards righteousness; *fourth* and last, in this that we embrace, and consequently hold fast, Jesus Christ as He is freely or gratuitously offered to us in the gospel. What does all this declare? Why, as clearly as words can by possibility declare it, they say that effectual calling is a *subjective* work effected by God's Spirit, and that it is inwrought upon our souls, and that this, as an infusion of divine grace, comprehends in it Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification.

Can these statements and the doctrine of Substitution agree? What is understood by substitution? We are told by hundreds that "the substitution of Jesus Christ in our room and stead frees us from the punishment which our sins have deserved"; and further, that "the price required for our redemption was paid by Christ when he expired upon the cross".

Look at the first of these statements. Freedom from punishment involves the pardon of sin; but the pardon of sin means Justification! Therefore Christ's substitution for us, and not the work of effectual calling, brings Justification! Can this consist with the Confession of Faith? How can it? Shall we be told that, while the price demanded for our individual redemption was paid for us on Calvary, there is thus no disputing the conclusion, that the *right* or *claim* of the creature to Heaven was thereby made good, and that the plan of God is that the *application* of redemption by the Holy Ghost, is the fulfilment of that claim? Then all lies on the application!

Digitized by Google

Yet the grace of God doth but place us in "a state of salvation" here: it is not salvation, but only the process towards salvation. Salvation in the full meaning of the word is not possible while we are at home in this our present material body. The application of redemptive grace therefore is but the preliminary necessary to obtain salvation. What then does substitution amount to? It is hereby eviscerated! for after all, it is reduced to the *application* of Christ. The payment of Christ on the cross can be regarded in these circumstances therefore as but a name, till we have the *application* of Christ; for we are taught that Christ is not ours, and that pardon is not ours, and that salvation is not ours, till we are *partakers* of Jesus Christ by faith.

There is still a fresh light in which to view this all-important question. I ask, what was the Lord's money which it is alleged He paid on our account? It will not be denied that *this money was His blood:* Yes! "The precious blood of Christ"! that constitutes the price paid for our redemption. What then? Observe what is demanded in order to effect this. There must be the *sprinkling* of this blood upon us before we can be redeemed. It is all-important to note this. It was not the mere fact of killing the victim, and thereby of letting out the blood of the sacrifice of the sin-offering, that constituted atonement; but it was the fact of *sprinkling* the blood, after the sacrifice was killed. And there was a wide distinction noted as to the blood, *before* the sacrifice was made, and as to the blood, *after* the sacrifice was made. The blood before the sacrifice was made, was regarded as the life of sin, and that life had to be poured out; but no sooner was the blood of the victim poured out, having fulfilled its purpose of

Digitized by Google

destroying sin, than it became consecrated blood; and *whatever it touched became holy to the Lord;* and hence the necessity of *sprinkling* this sacred blood, in order to the accomplishing of atonement.

Apply this law to Christ. He spilt His blood as man's blood upon the tree,—the blood of the flesh, therefore *our* blood which He made His, and being ours, therefore it was regarded as being the blood of sin; but when His sacrifice was accomplished, what was the character of His blood, the blood of His risen body? What was its nature? It was essentially *sacred blood* and therefore the blood which makes sacred: it was in Him the blood of the Spirit: the blood which alone can belong to a spiritual dispensation: the blood which alone sanctifies, the blood which alone can be received by faith. It was the blood which He carried with Him into the Holy of Holies: it was "the blood of sprinkling," which He has shed forth to purify a guilty world: the blood in which alone we are washed; the blood whereby alone we are cleansed,—the blood of atonement—the blood whereby alone the life of the old man is stanched, and the life of the new man is revived, whereby, in short, we are made new creatures, in short, whereby we have new life. Moreover does not our Church expressly tell us that we cannot have Christ's blood "after a corporal or carnal manner, but only by faith," and therefore of necessity "after a spiritual manner," "to our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace?"

But now if all this be true:—if the blood of the flesh, as but the mere essence of the flesh, "can profit us nothing"—what becomes of substitution? If "the application" of Christ crucified is alone effectual for our healing, that application, whereby we die with Him on

Digitized by Google

the one hand, and live with Him on the other hand,—whereby consequently we are "effectually called" from a state of sin, to a state of righteousness,—whereby in short we are regenerated and made one with Christ:—if the application of Christ, made by the sprinkling of the precious and purifying blood of Christ, alone conveys to us the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, what becomes of substitution, and what signifies substitution? It is a name! and only calculated to mislead, and to create confidences for safety, when no grounds for safety truly exist. Sinful men, living in their sins, cleaving to their sins, indulging their besetting sins from day to day, are only too thankful to be told that their debts are paid, that their sins are pardoned, that they are freed from punishment, that they are at peace with God, while the whole economy of their heart and life, is essentially opposed to God, and at war with God.

I think, then, that we are entitled to say that the dogma of Substitution is not consistently the doctrine of the Church of Scotland; and I dare have the courage to affirm that this very dogma is one of the greatest evils affecting the Protestant Church at this moment; for it is a dogma which not only gives the people commonly known as "Plymouth Brethren" a logical standing ground for the extravagant conclusions of their creed, but indirectly operates as a snare to professing christians generally. If that dogma is to hold good, then all is incongruity and inconsistency; for, in the first place, we see the simple fact broadly staring us in the face among professing christians, that the work of the devil is not destroyed—certainly not! if covetousness, and deceit, and lasciviousness among professing christians are tokens of that work; and yet with these

Digitized by Google

same professing christians, these indications go for nothing, and are regarded by them as though they were not, in as far as "such sinning will not be imputed to them!" a very convenient conclusion for self-satisfaction and supposed security, while yet they live a sinful life! It is to be feared that the holding of that doctrine makes many believe that they are justified before God, while yet they are in no proper sense sanctified; and, in consequence, the doctrine of sanctification is in a manner thrown overboard.

The holding of the doctrine of substitution obliges its votaries to throw upon Christ the accumulated burden of the scattered sins of every individual saved; and, therefore, the accumulated burden of the whole congeries of the saved, in one vast muster-roll of transgressions, as lumped together and amassed upon Him—a supposition which has no analogy in the world to support it—a supposition which, in a sense, brings sins into existence before they exist—a supposition which exacts payment before payment is due—a supposition which confounds all reason, and defies all explanation—a supposition, to my mind, as unworthy of God, as it is bewildering in every aspect in which I am able to view it. Moreover, it is a supposition which directly runs counter the whole tenor of the Word of God, in as far as it tells us that *our salvation*, as individuals, *has yet to be wrought out*—in as far as it tells us that we have to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling"—in as far as it tells us that our rewards or punishments are *defined and limited by our doings here below*, and that, *according as we sow, we shall be found to reap*. The doctrine of substitution, then, is assuredly antagonistic to the Word of God. It has led, and still leads, the

Digitized by Google

Church into the most unworthy shifts to reconcile herself with the Word of God, and with the imperative sanctions of our common reason. It has perplexed her with respect to the doctrine of predestination, with respect to the objects benefited by Christ's death (*i.e.*, what is called the extent of Christ's death), and, indeed, with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as the method whereby alone we stand related to, and become the recipients of, Christ's salvation.

I venture to maintain that the whole question of Christ's work hinges on the view I have endeavoured to present, of Christ's incarnation: the true doctrine of the Atonement can come to the light only through a sound understanding of the Divine and human natures of Christ; and that sound understanding is scarely attainable in all its proper distinctness, till we shall have achieved a correct knowledge of our own human constitution. I have already set forth what appears to be the clear and scriptural argument, as to the body which our Lord assumed. The difficulty, however, has been to connect the soul of man with his body, and to shew in what sense body and soul are one entire manhood, or one entire personality, as combinedly constituting the *man*. There can be no question, that whatever be the explanation of the alliance of the soul with the body (and I have ventured on an explanation which I have carried with me for 30 years), the Church is bound to believe that the corruption of the soul is effected through the body; for after telling us of the fall of man, we have it intimated to us, that "All mankind descending from him by *ordinary generation* sinned in Adam and fell with him in his first transgression". The plain English of this is, that we have

Digitized by Google

entailed upon us the birth-condition of corruptibleness; and this, through propagation of the flesh. I agree to this. But the question arises:—How comes the *soul* to be affected through the body?

I shall have opportunity otherwise of discussing this question;[1] but I may here notice that, if we knew somewhat more than is generally contemplated, of the nature of Spirit, the difficulty would vanish. We do know, as matter of experience, that the soul and body mutually affect each other: for example, that the conditions of the body are known and felt in our consciousness; and, again, that the conscious will does operate upon the body. Since we are so conversant with special states of consciousness, a question naturally arises:—How, or under what circumstances, is consciousness originated? It is not an attribute of matter, so far as we have any experience of matter. What then? I can here but simply indicate, that there is obviously for matter in the first place, an all-pervading spirit (pure spirit), as ground-substance throughout the Absolute Universe: that, in giving validity to created objects in the relationships in which they happen to be placed, all the forces function through the energy which is the attribute of this ground-substance, as pure spirit:—that this universal spirit-substance, thus objective to all matter, and consequently operative through the nerve-inlets attached to our animal frames, hath what we call a subjective side, which can be manifested only when a certain structured nerve-organisation in the

[1] See *Excursus*, XIII. and XVII., on the Psychological Problem. There will be some repetition in discussing this great question, but on a subject where there is likely to be misunderstanding and misrepresentation this is hardly to be avoided.

Digitized by Google

animal economy makes this possible—that the etherial side of this pure spirit which operates with matter, being formed into an individuality within, has along with it at this point, and as the crowning attribute for this individuality, its intellectual property developed into a *me*, conscious of its own states—conscious, as founded on the bodily economy, and conscious of the conditions which it has received through the internal senses.

This very brief summary can give but a very inadequate idea of soul, as connected with matter, yet developing mind; but here I can do no more than say, that soul, as pure spirit, has always an empty side for the manifestation of all conditions, however numerous; and this because of its exhaustless capacity to hold and give validity to all qualities, and so therewith to assume the form and character of a conscious self-hood.

Is it asked why the subjective side of spirit is manifested only in such circumstances? I answer that in no other circumstances can it be manifested. How can it be manifested if there be present no conditions, under which alone it can have the power and the freedom of its operation? The spirit of Intellectualism (*i.e.*, the subjective side of pure spirit) is as extensive as the spirit of Etherialism (*i.e.*, the objective side of pure spirit); but the objectivity can in no case have the prerogative of subjectivity (*i.e.*, of intellectualism) also annexed to it, unless there be an organisation built up whereby a conscious self can be developed, and its emotions can be responded to. When the senses come into operation, this conscious *me*, as in man, becomes filled with cognitions, as the reflex or image of impressions from without, and which are stored up within; and

Digitized by Google

hence he becomes a creature, endowed with knowledge, and therefore unlike to anything characteristic of mere matter. It is obvious then that the soul, so far as it is begotten through the flesh, can be regarded as first and fundamentally, but the constitution of intellectualism with carnal characteristics; and hence the cognition by Intellect of material conditions, and impressions from the outside world, which as impressions come to be manipulated by the apparatus within.

Are you now in a condition somewhat to apprehend the idea of the Lord Jesus in the flesh, and the mode, to some extent of His manifestation? We are told that the Holy Ghost "prepared" a body for Him in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Such a body, so prepared, must when born, naturally and necessarily develope for itself in intellectualism a soul varying through all the various phases of consciousness, from the merest infantile beginnings, to the ultimate perfection of matured knowledge, to reach which it was destined. But there is this important distinction attachable to the mental framework of the Lord Jesus as compared with that of mere and ordinary man. In ordinary man there is purely a soul begotten of the flesh, and capable only, when left to itself, to have at best, certain moral discernments, and the exercise more or less of some kind of moral will; but in the Lord Jesus Christ, there was additionally the impress of God, and consequently the mind and consciousness of God, ready to bear upon this human soul-development, according to its need. We must accept this, if we are to believe the Scriptures. It is not, of course, to be supposed for a moment, that God was exclusively confined to the person of Jesus Christ: no! God is over all His works; but what I

Digitized by Google

hold is, that "the form of God," the mind and nature of God, were in Jesus Christ, and in immediate bearing on the person of Jesus Christ; and this, without any confusion or amalgamation with the mind and nature of the manhood, as developed under the free presence of the living body of Christ. What have we then in the person of Christ? We have the nature of God and we have the nature of man. And further, we have the nature of man, not only developed precisely in accordance with the prepared body which he received, but left to battle with that world of sin, into which it had been introduced; and we have the nature of God, in what we might call the deep back-ground of His being, giving a holy consecration to His being, and supplying from the divine side whatever was needful for, and not inconsistent with, the freedom in which the humanity must be left, as simply supplied with abundant motive-power. In short, the divinity would operate as a grand moral and spiritual prompter over the soul; and through this again, the soul would operate as a strong and powerful agent against the assaults of sin.

That Jesus was subjected to the assaults of sin will not be disputed. We see it in the case of Satan's personal attempts; we see it in the efforts of the world; and we see it in the impulses of the flesh. The three great sources of our actual sinfulness are "the devil, the world, and the flesh"; and to have exempted Jesus from any one of these would have been to place Him out of the category of our humanity. The trials which come from the flesh are not so readily observable in Him, because they are more immediately personal, and in His person there could be discovered no sin, the same

Digitized by Google

being crushed in its risings; but that He had the emotions which belong to the body, and which are characteristic of the living body, cannot be doubted, when we find that He was the subject of appetite; and that weariness, anger, and sorrow, and such like, characterized Him; for, while He would not, and did not, permit these emotions ever to be developed in the complexion of sin, it was only through the flesh that the devil and the world could prompt Him to sin.

Can we then obtain a true, clear, Scriptural account of the condition of Jesus? The Scripture says Christ was "made sin"; and again the Scripture says in the same breath, that Christ "knew no sin". How can both statements be true? I think there is a clear, and to me convincing sense in which both statements are true, literally true, as regards Him Who is properly termed "the Wonderful".[1] We have seen that fundamentally Christ bore the impress of God, and therefore was God. Yes! in that He was "the express image" of the Father's person. We have seen farther, that in accordance with the nature of spirit as objective, *i.e.*, as accompanying all material conditions, there was laid through the material conditions the foundations of a human soul, that is a soul begotten in pure spirit through the material conditions of the human body given to Him.

How must it be veritably true then that the statement of the Apostle holds good, that "the Word was made flesh"? What are the facts? The facts intimated to us are these: that the Holy Ghost begat the foundation of a human body in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and therewith also conjoined the express impress of Himself, and so we are told "the holy thing that was born was

[1] See *Excursus*, XXIV., On Christ made sin.

Digitized by Google

called the Son of God". Here then is "the form" which belongs to, and which is one with the Eternal Son of God, manifested in human flesh, and developed so far as circumstances would permit in human flesh.[1] What then? Why "the Word" operated as "the Eternal Spirit," so that Christ could exercise priestly function, while the flesh was the victim "offered up" in sacrifice to God. That Christ took upon Him *our* flesh and blood, that He laid hold literally of what is *ours*, that there was the play upon His soul of all the ordinary impulses which pertain to *our* bodily nature, I cannot for a moment doubt, with the varied evidence set before us; and had Jesus been born according to ordinary generation, these impulses and propensities of the bodily nature would inevitably have led *Him* into sin, even as they lead *us* into sin. But He was not born under the self-same conditions as we are born: He was born with the *divine check* in all its fulness upon Him: He was born with the Divine Spirit "without measure" upon Him: He was born having a full controlling power, which prevented the flesh, even *our* flesh and blood in Him, having any ascendancy as a ruling power in his soul. Mark then the character of His soul. His

[1] The interpretation given of Phil. ii. 6, 7, confirms what is above stated. I am able to translate this famous passage only as follows:— "Who, being in the form of God, minded not the seizure as to His equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, (and so) being made in the likeness (identity) of man". This explains John's saying "the Word was made flesh". "The form of God" containing the intelligence of God and the love of God, became divested of the ubiquity of God, and was represented through a tabernacle of human flesh: it was therefore emptied of its proper omnipresence and freedom in entering into the human economy; but Deity reigned therein, for serving the ends of human redemption.

Digitized by Google

soul thus developed the purity of heaven itself, in that He was *en rapport* with heaven, and never once gave way to any incitements to sin; yet this does not in the least derogate from the fact that He was Himself exposed to all these incitements. We know that He underwent these incitements from the very fact that He was a partaker of our flesh and blood: we must know therefore that Jesus constitutionally had a great work to perform upon the earth. He had to destroy the life of that flesh and blood as naturally striving for ascendancy in a sin-smitten world; and no man can attentively read and examine the life of Christ, but must see that, at every turn in his career, the aims of the carnal part were thoroughly kept under, and perfectly subordinated to the Spirit.

This indeed was the one great object of His course throughout. Hence the real meaning of His words: "I came down from heaven *not to do Mine own will*, but the will of Him that sent Me"; and again, "My meat is *to do the will of Him that sent Me*, and *to finish His work*". It is of enormous importance to ascertain clearly what *God's work on man* was which Christ had to execute and to complete; and what that work involved. It was expressly to *undo the devil's work on man*. It was proved to the world that, when God worked on man *ab extra*, no permanent or indeed effective change could be wrought; and hence the exclamation "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he is also flesh," what then had to be done? This had to be done, *viz.*, *to bring the Spirit and the flesh fairly within the category of one personality, when the conflict could not by possibility be evaded, and one*

Digitized by Google

or other must succumb; and hence it could not be a matter of uncertainty.

In God's holy providence, then, the incarnation of Christ was brought about, which incarnation being the assumption of *our* flesh and blood, it behoved Christ to root out "the enmity" therein, "and so make peace". He had to put down the emotions and impulses therein from having any rule in the soul: He had, as He Himself expresses it, to "do cures" thereon: He had to rectify and "sanctify" and to "perfect" the same. We have the authority of Holy Scripture for these conclusions. Paul tells us that "He abolished the enmity in the flesh of Himself"; and again he tells us that Christ "made reconciliation by the body of His flesh, through its death," and that the circumcision of Christ denoted "the putting away of sins belonging to the flesh," and farther that Christ "having stripped Himself of their rule and authority, He blotted out in its decrees [*i.e.*, in its demands or exactions] the handwriting which was contrary to us, and removed that handwriting as an obstruction, by nailing it to His cross". Christ thereby "sanctified Himself," and this He did we are told "that *we also* might be sanctified through the truth"; and He being thus "made perfect, became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Luke xiii. 32; Eph. ii. 15; Col. i. 22, ii. 11, 14, 15; John xvii. 19; Heb. v. 9). Hence is made manifest to us what was precisely "the work given Him to do,"—the work which it behoved Him to accomplish—the work of abolishing sin from the human members—the work which established the headship of the Spirit over the members—the work of atonement, a *finished and perfected work;* and which has its efficiency on

Digitized by Google

us through the gift of the Spirit, as applying Christ's work, a gift poured forth under the economy of grace when the Lord Jesus Christ ascended to the Father, and established the Church-economy for proclaiming the means of our salvation.

The Apostle Paul laid great stress on our "discerning the Lord's body". And no wonder. It is only through this discernment that we can duly understand the very nature of that redemption effected by Christ: it is only through this discernment that we can fairly apprehend how Christ actually met the condition brought in by the first Adam, and undid that condition, and remedied that condition, and restored manhood to its true integrity by taking away sin and introducing righteousness. And it is only through this discernment that we can apprehend the Lord's body as it now is, a glorified body in the celestial state, *i.e.*, a spirit-body fitted for the precincts of Heaven, the essence of which is revealed to us in a spiritual dispensation, and of which we are verily made partakers through a preached gospel; and this more especially when celebrating the Lord's Supper, as the crowning symbol of the gospel economy; and hence it is only through this discernment that we can ever come duly to understand the symbolical language of the Lord's Supper, as the figurative representation of the precise features involved in the Christian dispensation,[1] —as that partaking of the body and blood of Christ, which infers a sharing not only in the death He underwent, but also in the life by which He was quickened: it is only through this discernment that we can ever duly appreciate what is signified by the appropriation of

[1] See *Excursus*, XXII., On eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.

Digitized by Google

Christ by faith, in order to our oneness with Him: generally we may say, it is only through a right discernment of the Lord's body, as dying to the natural body and clothed with the spiritual body, as putting off the old man and putting on the new, that we can fairly understand a multitude of Scripture-passages in their simply natural significance and application. It requires but "the blood of God," that is the application of that blood, as "the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," to free *us* in like manner from "the law of sin and of death, which is in our members".

Let us observe then, and duly consider that "foundation, other than which no man can lay," for our justification before God. We are told, Christ "partook of our flesh and blood, that through death (the death of course of the flesh and blood, as a ruling power in the soul) He might bring the devil to nought". This was the only way by which the discomfiture of the devil could be effected. A world of mystery has been made to hang around this question, which need not belong to it; and which, as belonging to it and confounding true exposition may assuredly be removed and ought to be removed. Had not God interposed by means of a Mediator such as Jesus Christ, the triumph of Satan would have been, that man must have perished, perished everlastingly; for so soon as the flesh of man became "sinful flesh" it must needs die: it could not live before God: *this in fact is the absolute and inexorable doom of all such flesh.* And if the soul, that is begotten through the flesh, has merely acquired the conditions which spring from the flesh, that soul cannot live: the flesh cannot give it life: it cannot give it a life which it does not possess for itself. What then was the great object of

Digitized by Google

Christ? The great object of Christ was to carry the doom of death against the flesh, into immediate execution, that He might graft upon the soul, and as from the Spirit itself, another life,—a new life,—a spiritual life,—a life which shall rise up in immortality, on the basis of the destroyed life. Here is the true theory of Regeneration. The doom of death, that is written against sinful flesh, must everywhere be fulfilled if life is to be implanted. Hence there is no distinction outwardly betwixt the heathen and the christian as to the *body* in respect of the article death: "All must die" because of sin. But there is a very wide distinction betwixt the heathen and the christian as touching the *soul*, and its destiny. The distinction is this, that the heathen carrying the body of sin with the impress thereof on the soul, to the grave, perishes body and soul forever: the latter, "bearing about with him the dying of the Lord Jesus," a dying which keeps the soul aloof from the dominion of the lusts of the body of the flesh, is therefore released from an obedience to the sins of the flesh. And while the body thus dies daily; and ultimately dies of necessity absolutely, as being the body in which either the remnants of sin remain, or in which the incitements to sin might be revived, there is now attached to the soul what of righteousness it has received from Christ, as that out of which a new body can spring, even a spiritual body fitted for the immortality of the celestial state.

Many have been perplexed that, under what is thought to be "the finished work of Christ,"—an expression by the way, which is much misunderstood, there should continue to be a world of sin and of death; but death must first be, if death is to be abolished; that is, death

Digitized by Google

must be if life is to be introduced. It is through death that we obtain life, because it is only upon the mortification of the flesh as a power over the soul, that scope is obtained for the introduction of the Spirit that giveth life. Hence the maxim which Christ hath left —"he that saveth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for Christ shall save it to life eternal". The carnal life then, which marks the vigor of the flesh, must be sacrificed by the christian (and this can be only through the operation of the Spirit) in order to the attainment of the spiritual life which marks the dominion of the Spirit. Paul tells us that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God"; and how could they, if it be true that "in the flesh dwelleth no good thing," that is no spiritual impulse as the only good for immortality? The sacrifice of the flesh then, is fundamentally the remedy, emphatically applicable to fallen man; because the essential characteristic of the fallen nature lies in the fact that the life of the body is projected on the soul, and is represented by the soul in consciousness, without any proper check for restraint or any end of the Spirit, for the purification of the soul. Hence the presence of the life-giving Spirit is extended to the soul, that we may be made "priests to God" for the performance of this sacrifice. The soul requires the benefit of Divine teaching in order to its spiritual discernment; and therefore in order to the acquisition of a spiritual inclination to will and do of God's good pleasure, there must be express spiritual instruction imparted by God and received by man. The phenomenon or ultimate feature of human life, since the fall of man, has been *the life of the flesh:* the phenomenon or ultimate feature of human life, ordained and instituted by

Digitized by Google

God, was *the life of the Spirit;* and the mere presentation of Divine things (Divine requirements, Divine righteousness), did not penetrate the soul of man, as was needful in order to their operation, because "the natural man (that is, the carnal man) receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God"; and if he do not receive them, he can, of course have no spiritual discernment; it behoved God, therefore, to make a direct assault upon the natural man.

This He hath done in the Mosaic dispensation, which was made therefore a dispensation of great severity—a dispensation full of terrors and alarms—a dispensation thundering death in unmitigated form to the sinner—a dispensation of repentance, for so it might be called, in that the best representation of that dispensation was in John the Baptist, who as the representative of the law, and as "a schoolmaster to lead men to Christ," gave forth the denunciations of sin by the law, in order to persuade men to cry out, "What shall we do to be saved?" This state of mind as alarming the soul on account of sin is alone the true state of mind for the reception of Christ. It is an arrestment laid on the absolute dominion of the flesh, and it is under this arrestment alone that a receptivity is produced in the soul for the admission of Christ and His righteousness. The process of admitting Christ and His righteousness into the soul properly belongs to a dispensation of faith, which is emphatically the characteristic of the Christian dispensation. Hence the two dispensations are now amalgamated in one; and we have two "saving graces," *viz.*, repentance and faith, as exercises indispensable for the sinner, in order to his regeneration, that is his conversion to become a saint. The spiritual con-

Digitized by Google

dition of man is thus the converse of his fallen condition, and becomes the restoration of his created condition. The fallen condition of man is an inroad on his created condition, in that it was the thrusting out from the soul of the spiritual things of God, and the setting up of the carnal in their stead; and hence the admission of the carnal to any amount of irregularities and excesses against moral law and against God. The regeneration or spiritual restoration of man is brought about by the reversion of this sinful condition. The flesh must be driven back from its power in the soul, first of all into its original and absolute subserviency to the Spirit; and *then* the spirit must stand placed over the soul as the law of operation to maintain it in that subserviency, as the power of the divine life therein.

Now, when the flesh is cast down from its dominion in the soul, it is particularly to be noted that this implies *the death of the flesh.* If I am asked to say what constitutes the life of the flesh, I at once answer its vitality as a power in the soul; and to destroy this vitality is to inflict death on the flesh. If the flesh naturally exists and prevails in rampant, unrestrained activity and intensity in the soul, and the soul is thereby hankering after excess, in order to its gratifications, as if these gratifications were the very end and object of existence, it is obvious that to stem and to stanch this activity is to check the current of its vitality; or in other words, to put a stoppage upon its animation,—to take away its breath, and to slay it. It is then that the soul is open to that which creates a contrary current, that is, it comes to be in a condition to receive the truth as it is in Jesus; and the creation of a contrary current is the

Digitized by Google

resultant of administering effectually the things of the Spirit of God.

The Scriptures everywhere set forth the necessity of this death, as the process of being freed from sin, and this as preliminary to a new life, as produced by the introduction of righteousness. Hear what Paul says: "Our old man (*i.e.*, the carnal man) is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin". For "he that is dead (dead to the flesh) is freed from sin". Again, the same Apostle says: "Mortify your members which are upon the earth"; and as himself practising what he preached, he says: "I keep my body under and bring it into subjection". And what does he call this? He calls this "bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus". Who can doubt, then, what this "dying," required of us, is, when through life He denied Himself to the flesh, and finally offered up His body on the tree? This is what the Apostle calls being "crucified with Christ," *i.e.*, crucified as Christ was. We commit a grievous mistake if we suppose that the crucifixion of the flesh was simply and exclusively the death on Calvary which took away sin; and because that was a death ending in terrible torments. The fact is that, before that final catastrophe, the flesh in Christ was absolutely slain; for the death on the material cross was but the *final* consummation of the doom that was written against the body of sin, that it might be removed for ever; and the devil and his agents had brought about these most awful pains and terrors only in order, if possible, to frighten Him from a submission to this death of the body when it was commanded by the powers that be. But this death was the triumph of

Digitized by Google

triumphs, in that it was the resignation or sacrifice of the last vestige of carnal life to death: and this though under the needless demand of the most revolting, odious, distressing, appalling and repulsive cruelties.

But Peter no less than Paul is emphatic upon this question of flesh-mortification. Peter says, "Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul". These fleshly lusts are the ruling elements, which have been mistakingly translated "principalities and powers," as if they referred to evil angels or devils, which we doubt not they are, though not in the sense of the angels which fell in heaven, and were cast out of heaven. These fleshly lusts contribute "the handwriting that is against us," and which Christ took completely out of the way, finally perfecting His work, by nailing the very foundation in which alone they could arise, to the tree. Again, Peter is very emphatic when he says, "forasmuch as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, *arm yourselves likewise with the same mind*"; and he adds what surely cannot now be misinterpreted, "for he that hath suffered in the flesh, hath ceased from sin". If, as the scriptures teach, the sin of man be fundamentally in the flesh, then the death of the flesh is the death of sin; but the death of the flesh is but another term for what Peter terms "suffering in the flesh"; and we see thus how true it is, and must be, that "the suffering in the flesh," which is brought about under the discipline of the Gospel, whereby the flesh is crushed and broken from its indulgence of sinful propensity, is but another expression for "ceasing from sin". All this is but the doctrine which our Lord himself expressly taught, and taught as directly applicable to Himself as well as to us, when He said, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it

Digitized by Google

abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit". It is obvious that the corn of wheat is the soul, as involved in carnal things; and the statement is, that if there be no death as to carnal things, it abideth in this carnal state, but if there be death to these carnal things, there is given the seed of a new life, and there springs up, therefore, a new and more glorious life of spiritual things. And forthwith, as illustrating his meaning, he adds the words we have already referred to, "he that loveth his life [as carnal] shall lose it, and he that hateth his life [the carnal life] in this world shall keep it [a life spiritual] unto life eternal.

I need not go into the law of the Old Testament as being *death to the body of sin.* This, indeed, was involved in the proclamation made to Israel, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die". And yet, notwithstanding the stringent and severe character of the law, so full of pains and penalties to the sinner—a law which was essentially repressive, if not oppressive, in its crushing tendencies against sin—it was, after all, weak to stem the violence of sin in the flesh; and, being unable to overcome the strength of the flesh, there was but one resource left; and that was for God to "send His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to condemn sin in the flesh"—a process which was alone effectual for this end.

We are brought therefore once more to contemplate "the foundation" as laid in Christ. "God sent forth His Son in the *likeness* of sinful flesh!" In the *sameness* of sinful flesh,—in the *identity* of sinful flesh—in the con-naturalness of sinful flesh; and then it is added "as touching the question of sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας) He condemned sin in the flesh". Such is the alone proper

Digitized by Google

translation, and it is very expressive. The wonder is how the meaning of such a passage could be evaded, more especially when the Apostle elsewhere says, that Christ "abolished the enmity in His flesh". We have seen what was "the end of the law," that is, the very purpose for which it was established, *viz.*, to *make the sacrifice of sin!* Well, what says the Apostle? "Christ was the end of the law," the fulfilling of the law—the realisation of the final object contemplated by the law—a realisation which the law's enactments by offerings were unable to fulfil. "He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," that is by the offering up of the body of sin which He assumed. We are told that Christ "took our flesh and blood," and therewith of necessity He took the attributes of our living body, and thereby He penetrated into the depths of our conditions—He operated upon these conditions, and in so doing He thrust back the dominion of sin from its pedestal of power, and separated sin therefore from having any place in the soul. Laying hold of what is emphatically ours, He had in consequence a work given Him to do, a work which entailed on Him the suffering involved in the sacrifice of the flesh, that is of that flesh and blood of ours which He took to Himself.

We thus see that Christ in His own person "laid that foundation, other than which no man can lay"—that foundation of a true, full, substantial, and satisfactory atonement for sin, which constitutes the very expiation of sin, the purging away of sin, and which, moreover, introduces a pure and perfect righteousness for acceptance with God. It was an atonement because it was the taking away of sin, and not becaase it was a suffering for sin. The mere element of suffering, as such, could

Digitized by Google

not and did not remove sin, and hence mere suffering, even in the Son of God, could have no intrinsic value in it, and therefore in itself could form no possible ground of satisfaction to God. Suffering as such had no real plea therefore as a basis of atonement before the Lord.

True it is, that sin cannot, and never could, be put away without pain; but it is not the pain, but the removal of the sin, which constitutes atonement. Pain or suffering is but the accompaniment of atonement, an accompaniment which is indispensable, because unavoidable, in making atonement; but it is an utter misconception for that reason to put down the *suffering* instead of the *abscission* of the evil which causes the suffering, as the satisfying ingredient in atonement. We may call the suffering by the name of punishment, as indicating that *we* deserve this pain; but whatever be the name we give to the suffering, the suffering is of no value whatever in itself. No doubt, it implies a wrenching and consequent dislocation of the evil complained of; and hence the impossibility of separating suffering from atonement; but as it is the evil which is alone the offence, and which constitutes man to be a sinner, and makes him hateful to God, so it is the wrenching of it, and not the suffering, which is involved in the wrenching, which makes atonement. The suffering may be termed a pain, a price, a penalty, or the like; and as such, it may well be regarded as a *price* which had to be paid in the separation of sin from the soul; but after all, the price is one thing, and the thing effected by paying the price is another. And in looking at the question of atonement it is the effect of the penalty, the

Digitized by Google

result of the suffering, which has to be regarded; and this effect is *the blotting out* of our sin.[1]

Let us understand then the sacrifice which Christ underwent. Christ, we are told, was "put to death in the flesh," and there was much awful suffering, we would say unnecessary suffering, in the process. We say *unnecessary* so far as God was concerned to impose suffering; and we say *unnecessary* so far as Christ was willing to encounter suffering; but "the powers of darkness" would have it so, in order, if possible, to scare Christ from the ordeal, *i.e.*, if possible to secure that Christ should resile from death, when associated with such tortures. But when it was the Father's good pleasure not to interpose in the battle between Christ and the powers of darkness, but to leave Him to fight out the contest which He had hitherto successfully waged against them, Christ meekly submitted to this terrible ordeal, whereby not only the breath of the body was finally stifled, and all that pertained to the carnal was absolutely given up, a perfect sacrifice to God; but this was submitted to under the most trying and repulsive features. Truly could it well be said that He "reconciled humanity in the body of His flesh, through its death," for not only had His body become dead to the law of sin; but the last vestige of life in that body was yielded up under circumstances which might well have daunted Him, as being a horrid and unnecessary cruelty. But it was absolutely necessary that Christ should face any amount of terrors in the execution of His purpose, and therefore these terrors, great as they were, and great as He foresaw them to be, could not shake Him from the purpose of meeting death, even in

[1] See Lecture IX., On the Remission of Sin.

Digitized by Google

the way that the devil prepared for Him. Christ accomplished His work, and the redemption of the body was perfected; for now that it was thus made utterly dead, He was prepared for the introduction of a new body, a spirit-body, a glorified body, having a new and glorious life, the life of the spirit, the life of righteousness, the life which arises from the presence of "the blood of God," a life absolutely penetrated by the Spirit of God, and in harmony therewith.

The beginning had been made in the *Head*, now it must be made in the *members*. "As He is, so are we in the world." "He hath consecrated for us a new and living way," literally He hath *inaugurated* this for us—He hath afresh begun or introduced this, that the process may go on in our members, and therefore this new and living way must be trodden by all who shall enter into glory. It is not needful that we undergo the violence which overtook Him as He ended this life upon the tree; yet we must undergo death and that tribulation to the flesh which constitutes its death, and through which it behoveth us to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Such a sacrifice is the "door" through which we must pass in order to enter into the fold of righteousness. Christ is "the door". We may not climb into that fold by any other way. We must "die with Christ, *that* we may live with Him". We are "baptized into His death," *i.e.*, to die with Him; and as by our very baptism we have "the sentence of death in ourselves," we have to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in our flesh," in order that we may be "made conformable to His death," as the one ground-requirement of the Gospel. This, we repeat, is the aim of Christianity, *viz.*, "to put on the Lord Jesus," to "show forth His death

Digitized by Google

till He come". If we fail in this aim, we fail in fulfilling our Christian calling.

How simple, then, is the doctrine of Atonement: simple in its "foundation," simple also in its "application". Its principles are obvious, and commend themselves to our highest reason: they are sufficiently defined, and they correspond with our most rigid conclusions: they are in most thorough accordance with the whole word of God, and are worthy of God, being in perfect harmony with the attributes of God: they are in beautiful agreement with all that is said of the Lord Jesus Christ; and while they show the relationship in which He stood to sin, they establish the fact that His whole soul was antagonistic to sin, and that His whole aim was to put away sin, and bring in righteousness into the human frame. They accurately fulfil all the types and shadows of Old Testament symbol respecting atonement; and not least in that remarkable change which was proclaimed in regard to the blood of the sin-offering; for the victim having become "the sin" of the offerer, by the contamination of laying his hands thereon (not that the offerer was thereby freed from his sin), a lesson was taught to the offerer, that "death is the wages of sin," and that this lesson might be practically impressed, the blood of the victim "made sin," *i.e.*, his sin-offering, was poured out, that the life of the sin might be destroyed.

But what of that blood afterwards? Why, *that blood became sacred*, and whosoever was sprinkled with that blood became "holy to the Lord"; and *the sprinkling* of the blood therefore constituted, and alone constituted, atonement before God; and that blood was carried into the Holy of Holies, that is into the imme-

Digitized by Google

diate presence of God, that God might see it and approve of it, and give His sanction to it, as cleansing blood. The blood of Christ's body was poured out, even the blood which He received from His mother; but the blood of His resurrection, and consequently of our justification, was the consecrating blood which He took with Him into the skies: that is the cleansing blood, the blood in which alone we can be washed clean; the blood which alone sanctifies and consecrates us to God: the blood which, on the one hand puts away sin, and on the other hand bestows righteousness: it is the blood of our regeneration—the blood which gives us new life and makes us acceptable to God. The blood of the flesh "profiteth nothing," even if it were possible for us to be sprinkled therewith: when Christ speaks of His body and blood, of which we must become partakers, He tells us that His words imply "that which is spirit and that which is life". We partake of Christ's body and blood that we may have life, and because without these we cannot have life. Christ partook of *our body and blood*, that first of all He might offer the same in sacrifice to God, as something to be yielded up and put away, and that we becoming "conformed to His death" might be made partakers of *His precious body and blood* to our spiritual nourishment and growth for glory. Hence we have to "die with Him, that we may live with Him". As Christ was put to death in the flesh, so must it be with us; as Christ was quickened in the spirit, and thus had the blood of God shed on His human nature, and therefore the life of God therein, so must it be with us.

Hence we see that, while Christ died as our representative, He did not die as our substitute—that while Christ died as man, and as man sacrificing and abolishing all

Digitized by Google

that was offensive to God, and thereby purchasing a glorious and complete redemption for humanity, He died in order that by the sprinkling of His precious and redeeming blood upon us He might bring His work to bear on us, and call into play the process of His own redemptive work in our souls. If this be effected, all is effected: if Regeneration be accomplished, Atonement is of necessity implied therein, and consequently Redemption is accomplished. For what is Redemption? Redemption is deliverance from sin, deliverance by the Cross, deliverance by our crucifixion with Christ, deliverance by means of the living stream which comes from the fountain which is opened up in Christ. "The saints overcome by the blood of the Lamb." We, having this potent element, are made "kings and priests unto God"—"kings" to rule over our carnal nature, "priests" to sacrifice our carnal nature, in conformity with "the dying of the Lord Jesus".

May the Lord open our eyes to see the true features of the gospel: may He remove the veil which blinds our understandings and our hearts, so that we are no longer credulously relying on a substitutionary sacrifice for our salvation, while we yet remain steeped in sin, which in point of fact is nothing better than dependence on an abstraction of which we have had no participation. As Christ came to "save His people from their sins," so let us know that "to whom we yield ourselves servants to obey, his servants we are whom we obey"; and if we are the servants of Christ, then we cannot be "the servants of sin". Our business ought to be, then, to ask (and each for himself) which is the sin that besets me, and obstructs my progress in the divine life? Let me shake it off, let me cast it from me, even as Paul

Digitized by Google

cast the venomous beast that fastened on him into the fire, that it might be consumed and put out of the way, he himself having thereby escaped all harm. God gives *you* the power to do this: use this power, and you will succeed.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

THE TRUE TABERNACLE.

"But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption."—HEB. IX., 11, 12.

THERE is a vast deal in those two verses, of which we can, at the present, take little notice. The point therein to which I desire chiefly to draw your attention, is that which speaks of Christ having come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands. At the same time, it would be well to see clearly the general idea which absorbs the mind of the Author.

There is no doubt it is the high priesthood of Christ. We have good acquaintance with the office of priesthood, as it was ministered among the Jews: Christ is here represented as coming a High Priest, ministering the things of the Gospel. How does He manage this? The answer is given: He comes *by means of* a greater and more perfect tabernacle—a tabernacle not made with hands—a tabernacle not of this building, or rather *not of this creation*, as a gross material scene of things. I prefer to say "by means of" (διὰ), rather than "by," and much rather than "through," though this latter word is

Digitized by Google

employed by our late revisers. The Apostle evidently wishes to show by what direct agency Christ executeth His wonderful priesthood now, and he tells us directly it is "by means of a greater and more perfect tabernacle". Of this I shall speak directly; but further, he intimates in what respect it was unlike the priesthood which was exercised among the Jews. They slew animal victims: not so did Jesus Christ. They presented the blood of goats and of calves: not so did Jesus Christ. He presented His own blood; and "by means of *His own* blood, He entered once for all into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption". The words, "for us," are not to be found in the original; and, therefore, ought not to be inserted.

It is obvious that the great object of the Author is to shew by what instrumentality or intervention He now fulfils His great office as the High Priest of God. Hence, as we are told that this comes about "by means of a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made by hands"; it is of exceeding moment to know what this greater and more perfect tabernacle is, and what it signifies. When he speaks by comparison of a greater and more perfect tabernacle, there is no doubt whatever that he compares the tabernacle now belonging unto man, and once belonging unto Christ, with the new tabernacle freshly achieved by Christ—"a greater and more perfect tabernacle".

There were two tabernacles, he tells us, under the Old Testament. They were intimately connected, so far as Old Testament worship was concerned. He briefly describes them in the passage from which the text is taken. The first, he says, had the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread, which is called the

Digitized by Google

Sanctuary (*i.e.*, the Holy Place), and after the second vail, the tabernacle, which is called the Holy of Holies, having a golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the Covenant, and above it the cherubim of glory over-shadowing the mercy seat, "of which things (he says) we cannot now speak particularly," that is, severally and specially.

Much may be said on these two tabernacles: much has been written upon them. Of course it is but a general idea that I can here give respecting them. The whole building was designed by God; and the materials for their construction were supplied by voluntary contributions. The atonement-money went to constitute the silver sockets, and the foundation on which its pillars rested. There was a golden framework resting on the silver foundation—a framework easily taken to pieces, yet of great stability. There were curtains again, and coverings of varied work over the boards of the tabernacle, and skins which formed the roof or tarpauling over all.

It ought to be mentioned, that in immediate connection with the outer tabernacle, was what was called "the court". This court had some 60 pillars, overlaid with brass, with hangings of net-work; and all became a sacred enclosure, having in the centre the brazen altar with horns projecting at each corner. Therein, also, were "the laver and his foot," the former to hold water for the priests, and for washing the sacrifices; the latter (a saucer-like basin), which received the supply of water as needed from the laver.

The table of shew-bread was overlaid with gold, and

Digitized by Google

stood on the north side of the holy place. The bread, which consisted of fine flour, was unleavened, and stood always on the table in the form of 12 cakes, in two rows; and was renewed week by week every Sabbath by fresh loaves. The golden candlestick was made of a talent of gold, having one upright shaft and three arms or branches on each side. The oil which supplied the lamps was pure oil, beaten in a mortar. The lamps burned by day as well as by night, there being no windows in the tabernacle. Within the first tabernacle, also, was the golden altar, as distinguished from the brazen altar, which stood in the court. It was similar in shape to the brazen altar, and had the projecting horns at the four corners. It was named golden, because, though made of wood, it was overlaid with gold; and it was, properly, the altar of incense, because incense alone was offered there by the high priest every morning and evening; and this spread a fragrance all around, penetrating the vail, and reaching even to the throne in the holy of holies.

Behind the vail, and within the Holy of Holies, stood "the Ark of the Covenant". The former was "four square," 10 cubits long, 10 broad, and 10 high: the latter was a box or chest overlaid without and within with gold. In the ark were deposited the two Tables of Stone, on which the ten commandments were written by the finger of God. Hence it was called *the Ark of the Covenant*, because the moral law formed the basis of the covenant with God. Besides the ten commandments, there was the golden pot with the manna in it. There was likewise therein "the rod of Aaron that budded". The lid of the ark, that covered all, was called "the mercy-seat". It was wholly of pure gold, while the

Digitized by Google

rest of the ark was but overlaid with gold. It was hereon that God showed Himself merciful in forgiving sin. It was by means of the blood sprinkled on the mercy seat that God was propitiated, and forgave the sins of the people, and dispensed blessings to Israel. I ought to mention, that on this mercy seat there stood two cherubim, *i.e.*, two figures partly of human form gazing down upon the ark, but having wings which stretched overhead from behind, and met at the tips of the wings. Here, also, was the Shekinah, or visible presence of God, which filled the space between the mercy seat and the overshadowing wings of the cherubim. It appears to have been a supernatural brightness or splendour resembling a bright cloud or flame, and was called "the glory". Here, then, was the throne-room of God; here the high priest, as representing the people, met God; and for himself and for them obtained the forgiveness of sins.

I may not dwell longer on the tabernacle as a whole, nor on its furniture; but it is obvious that there was a relative importance, as well as sacredness, in the Holy of Holies, as compared with the Holy Place. Whether we look to the door-pillars, the door-hangings, the curtains, the furniture, the persons, or the peculiar numbers attached to each, the Holy of Holies bore the palm. The gate-*pillars* of "the Holy Place" were overlaid with brass, and stood in brazen sockets: those of the door of "the Holiest of all" were overlaid with gold, having silver sockets to rest on. The *hangings* for "the gate of the court" was of neddle work, blue, purple, and scarlet, and fine trimmed linen; and the same also for the door of the Holy Place; but "the vail" of the Holy of Holies was superior to these, in that it was not

Digitized by Google

only variegated by the same bright colours, but was of "cunning work," having cherubic figures interwoven therein. The *curtains* also, that formed the court-walls, and also the walls of the Holy Place, were inferior to those in the Holiest of all; for in the latter alone were hung with gorgeous tapestry all round, and were resplendent with bright colours and lovely cherubs.

The *furniture*, again, of the Holy of Holies, was superior to that of the court or of the Holy Place. In the Court, as I have said, the altar of burnt offerings, overlaid with brass, and between it and the sanctuary, the laver made of fine brass: in the Holy Place, called also the Sanctuary, were the shew-bread-table and the altar of incense, both overlaid with gold, and the splendid lamp-stand, of seven branches, made of pure gold; but the furniture of the Holy of Holies embraced not only the ark of the covenant, but the mercy seat and the cherubim of glory, made of pure gold, and the miraculous symbol of the Divine presence, filling the space between the mercy seat and the overarching wings of the cherubim.

Then as regards the *persons*, the common people had access to the court, while the priests had access to the sanctuary, but the High Priest alone had access to the Holiest of all. And as regards the *exposure*, the court was open to, and lighted from, the sky; the Holy Place was covered over, and lighted by the introduction of the perpetual lamp; but the Holy of Holies, besides being covered over, was lighted therein by the Shekinah itself, or the divine glory resting therein.

The *numbers* also are noticeable. The court was 100 cubits long: there were 4 colours on the gate. The brazen altar was 4 square, and had 4 horns and 4 rings.

Digitized by Google

Its pillars were 5 cubits high, and were 5 cubits separated from one another: the hangings were 5 cubits high: the brazen altar was 5 cubits long and 5 broad: and the length of the court and the breadth, which was half the length, were multiples of 5. In the Sanctuary, again, we find the symbolic number 10 to be prominent. This tabernacle, sometimes called "the habitation," was 10 cubits high and 10 broad. There were 10 cherub curtains and 10 goats' hair curtains, while the entire number of silver sockets was ten times 10. Four (another of the numbers of perfection) occurs in the tabernacle, and far more prominently than in the court. The vails were each 4 square: the roof was fourfold: four colours appeared in the vails and also in the cherubic curtains. The number of boards was 48, and the number of sockets 96, both multiples of four. In the Holy Place, as the inner part of the tabernacle, was the golden altar, which was 4 square, and had 4 rings and 4 horns, and the shew-bread table, which had 4 rings and 12 cakes, a multiple of four. But there was here the most sacred number of all, namely—the golden candlestick, with 7 branches, its 7 lamps, and its sevenfold light. Here there is a superiority in respect of the perfection of the numbers. Farther, when we come to the Most Holy Place, we are called to observe, that the blood of the sin offering, on the great day of atonement, was sprinkled seven times before the mercy seat. The other sacred numbers, 4 and 10, were peculiarly prominent here. The Holy Place was an oblong, a double square, but the Holy of Holies was a perfect square, the length and breadth and height being equal. The roof, the floor, and the walls, north and south, east and west, were each 10 cubits every way, that is, 10

Digitized by Google

cubits square, in every way a perfect square of the significant symbolic number *ten*. Here, also, were the *ten* commandments planted by God, as the law proclaimed from Himself for human guidance. Here, then, was the region of pre-eminent beauty, perfection, and glory: here was the special dwelling-place of God, the innermost chamber, to which the high priest alone had access; and had access, moreover, as one that was freed from all sin—as one that had made atonement for all his sin; thus only he now approached the presence of God, with the blood of atonement craving and obtaining the acceptance of God; and this, too, with a view to carrying Divine benefits home to the children of Israel.

But, without doubt, the high priest was a type of the Lord Jesus Christ; but among the multitudinous enactments of the Mosaic economy, there were symbolical teachings of what constituted portions or departments of Jesus Christ, and of that dispensation, or, indeed, dispensations to come, of which the Jewish dispensation supplied the type. And there can be nothing more valuable to us than to find out what spiritual meaning is to be gathered from the institution of the tabernacle as a whole, and of the tabernacle service as it prevailed among the Jews. In thus penetrating to its true meaning, we shall obtain a deeper insight into the person of the Lord Jesus, and of the service which He rendered to God. The Church no doubt directly knows a great deal respecting Christ; but it is a question whether she has obtained that fulness of knowledge which is obtainable respecting Him, and which, when obtained, must go far to remove mysteries, and to simplify the grand scheme of christian doctrine, propounded by the Gospel of our Lord.

Digitized by Google

We are called by the text to sift and search into the whole question of the tabernacle. We have seen generally of what it literally consisted, as an institution in Israel: there must be a greater and more perfect tabernacle in christianity, by means of which Christ Jesus has accomplished His work of atonement; and in plain terms, too, we are told that this tabernacle, so spoken of, is one not made by human instrumentality; farther, we are told it is a tabernacle not made of this building, or rather not of this creation. This creation, in which we are more immediately involved, is material. Our bodies are material; the world on which we dwell is material; our homes are material; the food which we eat to keep our bodies alive is material; but here in the text we have a tabernacle spoken of, which is not only not made with hands, *i.e.*, with human hands, but it is not belonging to the creation, with which we are now more immediately cognisant.

When we consult commentators respecting the meaning and interpretation of our text, we find great variety of sentiment. Old Thomas Scott says, that Christ is here spoken of as "officiating as High Priest in a greater and more perfect tabernacle than that prepared by Moses, and even than the temple built by Solomon, or any made with hands; that is to say, in one not builded after the manner of men, or even like the lower creation, being the contrivance of infinite wisdom and the work of Almighty power. This may be explained either of His holy human nature in which He tabernacled on earth, and officiates as Priest in heaven, or rather of the heavens themselves, where He appears in the presence of God for us." When Mr. Scott speaks of Christ's holy human nature, I apprehend he means

Digitized by Google

the tabernacle of flesh and blood which he showed upon the earth. If so, the question arises, was there no change made upon that tabernacle of flesh and blood when He rose from the dead, and entered into glory? Paul says, "though we have known Christ after the flesh, we now know Him so no more". Yet Christ is embodied in a tabernacle of glory, and therein has He appeared before the presence of the Father with the acclamations of angels. Mr. Scott makes no allusion to this change which was effected upon the earthly body of the Lord Jesus. But farther, Mr. Scott is not sure if his interpretation is correct, and therefore he proposes an alternative meaning to the words in question, and makes the greater or more perfect tabernacle to be "the heavens themselves". It is at least awkward to speak of the heavens as a tabernacle: we might as well speak of the earth as a tabernacle, which is never done. We may speak of tabernacling upon the earth, but this only goes to shew that the tabernacle in which we dwell exists upon the earth. So, as regards the heavens, these cannot with any propriety be termed a tabernacle, but must be regarded as the dwelling-place in which the tabernacle is found. Mr. Scott, therefore, can hardly be regarded as reaching to the precise interpretation of the text.

Whitby makes the tabernacle here spoken of to be "the holy mansion in which the Divine Majesty resides gloriously in opposition to the earthly holy place which was made with hands"; and he refers to verse 23rd of this chapter, where the things on earth are spoken of as copies or patterns of the things in the heavens. There the inspired Author says, "it was necessary that the *patterns* of the things in the heavens should be cleansed

Digitized by Google

with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these". But what are "the heavenly things themselves"? Why, Whitby himself makes these to be our bodies, which have to be received into heaven, and which are purified by the blood of Christ. We know that the furniture of the tabernacle had to be touched with blood, and, consequently, purified by the application of the atoning blood; and if Whitby is consistent, the whole of the materials embraced in the tabernacle-service must in that case be regarded as elements essential to our bodies. And what does the Apostle go on to say? "For Christ entered not into the sanctuary made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." There can be no doubt that "heaven itself" is here put for the sanctuary in heaven, as in apposition with the sanctuary on the earth; this is but an ordinary anacolouthon, very common in the Scriptures; and there can hardly be a doubt, that as the earthly tabernacle had its reality on earth, so it is intimated that the heavenly tabernacle had its reality in the heavens; and that Jesus presented Himself before God in the true tabernacle there. I cannot believe, then, that Whitby has reached the full estimate of the text.

MacKnight holds to the idea that the greater and more perfect tabernacle means the ministry which He performed on earth, *viz.*, His dying and presenting His crucified body before the throne of God in heaven, as a sacrifice for sin. He declines to suppose the tabernacle to be our Lord's human nature, as some suppose it to be, because, as he says, "it appears an absurdity to say that Christ entered into the holy place through His own

Digitized by Google

human nature, as through a tabernacle. He entered into heaven clothed in His human nature, and not through it, as through a place; for on that supposition, He did not carry His human nature with Him into heaven." MacKnight mistakes, like many others, the precise meaning of the preposition *through*. It is important to understand what is really the application of the preposition here. If applied to a *place*, the "through" means passage through the place to some other place; and in this sense it is employed after verbs of motion, such as coming and going. If, however, it be applied to the *instrument*, through which anything is effected, the "through" signifies "by," or "by means of," "in virtue of," "through the intervention of". That the instrumentality by which Christ effected the great salvation is referred to, we can hardly for a moment doubt, seeing not only "the tabernacle" is referred to, and a peculiar tabernacle too, but that instrumentality which existed among the Jews, *viz.*, the blood of animal-victims, is set aside, and His own blood is spoken of as the satisfying ingredient whereby He accomplished His end. There can be no doubt, then, but that the preposition in this case must be translated "by means of"; as if the Apostle said—As there was a tabernacle on earth, *by means* of which the Jews performed divine service to God, so there is a tabernacle in heaven *by means* of which service is rendered there: this latter is the greater and more perfect, and Christ had it; and *because of* this He was welcomed into heaven. MacKnight bordered on the true significance of the passage, but, like others, he has failed duly to detail it. The fact of Christ entering into the immediate presence of God, with the blood, not of an earthly tabernacle,

Digitized by Google

but of a tabernacle made without hands, demands careful consideration.

Some of the German commentators have given great attention to the interpretation of this text. There is a lengthy discussion of separate views in the commentary superintended by Lange, and of which Dr. Mall is the Author. He regards σκηνή "as a designation of the tabernacle in general". The manner (he says) in which Christ has become a high priest, is here not in the question: the Author is simply setting forth the fact, that by His high priesthood, not a symbolical, but a true and actual reconciliation with God had been effected. He is a high priest, not of the earthly, but of the heavenly tabernacle. This heavenly sanctuary he called "the genuine tabernacle" (viii. 2), of which Christ is λειτουργος, or minister: and he here styles it "the better and more perfect tabernacle," which he characterises as that not built by hands, *i.e.*, founded, indeed, but not belonging to this world, as that by means of which Christ has historically appeared, and exists as high priest of the good things to come; in the same way as the Jewish high priest, by means of the Mosaic tabernacle, became the priest of symbolical and typical blessings. He, by means of the blood of goats, entered into the Holy Place; and this corresponds to the Holiest of all, or the dwelling-place of God. This Author makes of no moment, whatever, the distinction to which the inspired penman most emphatically points, *viz.*, an outer and an inner tabernacle. He would confine the Apostolic view thus, that as there was a tabernacle belonging to the world, material and made with hands, so there is a genuine archetypal tabernacle, pure, heavenly, spiritual, not made with hands, not of this

Digitized by Google

creation. As the Levitical priesthood ministered in the typical tabernacle, and brought into it the blood of bulls and of goats, so Christ ministers in the heavenly, spiritual, and archetypal tabernacle, offering His own blood.

There is a large amount of truth in what this Author says, but I think he fails to grasp the profound sentiment to which the Epistle to the Hebrews points, as the distinction betwixt what may be called *earthly*, and what may be called heavenly *priesthood;* or, rather, he fails to grasp the idea, that there is a true priesthood on earth, as preliminary and preparatory to a true priesthood in heaven. It seems to me that the typical distinction of an outer and inner tabernacle pointed to this discrimination, and must have had a real significance under New Testament ideas. In the Old Testament there was a direct connection betwixt the outer tabernacle and the inner; and the service of the outer tabernacle was essential to that performed in the inner. The blood of the outer tabernacle had to be *shed* before that of the inner tabernacle could be *shown.* It was only when the sacrifice made in the outer tabernacle had done its work that the high priest could be regarded as thoroughly cleansed and purified: then and only then could he go and shew himself; and taking his blood along with him, present it for acceptance in the throne-room of God. There must needs be a change of tabernacle in either case; and therewith a change in the material, by means of which acceptance in either case was achieved. In the former case, when the sin offering came before the Lord, it behoved the blood of sin to be poured out, that the life of sin might be destroyed; and, consequently, that the offensive thing, as an active power, might be

Digitized by Google

taken out of the way. When this was achieved, however, the blood of the sin-offering acquired a new character (the sin being eliminated), and it was regarded as "most holy"; *and in these circumstances it was taken before the Lord. Such were the ingredients of priesthood as proclaimed to Israel.* We have then to find out, under the New Testament, the reality to which these Old Testament shadows pointed. Assuredly Dr. Mall's exposition fails in this respect.

Ebrard, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, says, that "the import of the clause is this:—Christ entered into the Holy of Holies by a more perfect tabernacle than that by which the Old Testament high priests entered into the Holy of Holies. In what respects that Holy Place, by which Christ entered into the Holy of Holies, was better than the Holy Place of the Mosaic tabernacle, is now shown in the words, 'not made with hands, *i.e.*, not belonging to this creation'. 'In opposition to the Mosaic typical *πρώτη σκηνή*, is placed a real *πρώτη σκηνή*, which bears the same analogous relation to the Mosaic, as the New Testament Holy of Holies' into which Christ entered bears to the Mosaic Holy of Holies." If the Author had said that the first tabernacle in the New Testament bears the same relation to that Holy of Holies into which Christ is *now* entered, as the first tabernacle in the Mosaic dispensation bore to the Holy of Holies into which the high priest entered, he would have proclaimed a very valuable truth—a truth embodying the essentials of christian doctrine. The Author goes on to say that, "if the clause, 'not belonging to this creation,' were not there, one might be contented to understand this more perfect tabernacle of the canopy of heaven, the sidereal

Digitized by Google

heavens, through which Christ passed into the upper heaven, the sphere of glorified corporality subject to no death or change. But that clause which is added (he thinks) renders every explanation of this kind impossible. Moreover (he says), the parallel between the heavens and the Mosaic *πρώτη σκηνή* would be altogether without significance. In what would the analogy between the two *σκήναι* consist? There is the mere outward circumstance, that the Mosaic *πρώτη σκηνή* stood locally outside the Mosaic Holy of Holies, and that the visible heavens are outside of the heavenly Holy of Holies. But such frigid parallelisms are not in accordance with our Author's manner. We must rather seek the key to the solution of verse 11 in the profound and subtle thoughts of verses 8-10. It was there shown that the Mosaic Holy of Holies was itself only typical: the antithesis between the Mosaic and the heavenly Holy of Holies is essentially not so much one of place, as rather of time and quality. It is not the heaven viewed as a place, that makes the true Holy of Holies, but the heaven and the throne of God, as the scene of the finished true atonement and reconciliation of God with man."

This Author makes the Mosaic Holy Place to represent outward purity and temporary conformity to the law; and true moral inward holiness, the symbolical antithesis. Hence the Holy of Holies into which Christ entered, he makes to be, not heaven as a place, but the *act* of exaltation and the *time* of His being exalted. He would say: in as much as Christ was made under the law, His act of passing through this state, *i.e.*, His act of living in a state of humiliation, *i.e.*, therefore His perfect inward fulfilment of the law, *i.e.*, His holy life

Digitized by Google

was the τελειότερα σκηνή (the more perfect tabernacle) through which He passed to His state of exaltation.

That Ebrard has got hold of a truth in this exposition is not to be denied; but that he expresses the precise truth, which the Apostle proclaims or enounces as the principles, on the basis of which the Apostle founds his statement, I cannot believe. The Apostle sets forth a first and second tabernacle service, performed by a priesthood constituted among the Jews, and intimates obviously that *this twofold service*, each distinct in itself, but having a dependent bearing, the latter upon the former, is a figure or *type of an existing state* under the christian dispensation, as being the realization of the good things then shadowed forth.

The point before us, in these circumstances, is to find out—*what is there in the christian economy which answers to this twofold representation?* He tells us clearly, that "by means of a greater and more perfect tabernacle," Christ has entered into the Holy Place of God—the immediate dwelling-place of God; and we must not therefore confound the tabernacle as one and the same thing with the Holy Place. I shall inquire into the question of the tabernacle immediately; but I have here to ask—How did Christ obtain the second tabernacle? Was it not after the analogy prescribed by the law? Under the law, the ordinary priesthood was exercised in the first tabernacle, in which sacrifices were offered to God for *individual sins*. This admitted the possibility of a high priesthood coming forward, having accomplished the service of God in the first tabernacle, to make offering to God in behalf of *the community;* and then presenting an atoning blood to be sprinkled upon them. The means whereby these two states are

Digitized by Google

achieved are all-important as elements of the New Testament dispensation. *There is a tabernacle*, then, in which Christ first offered sacrifices to God, *preliminary to the tabernacle* in which He now presents His blood, as the blood of redemption, to be sprinkled upon us all. In the one tabernacle we find Him in the Holy Place, that is, the place designed to be made holy by the covenant of sacrifice: in the other tabernacle we find Him in the Holy of Holies, *i.e.*, in the more immediate presence of God; and we find Him there in "that greater and more perfect tabernacle made without hands," the blood of which is the righteousness of God while it cleanseth from all sin. I distinguish, then, the tabernacle *in which sacrifice for sin has to be rendered*, as being the tabernacle which has its foundation and locality upon the earth, from the tabernacle *in which holy blood is presented*, and which has its foundation and locality in a place not seen by man, that locality wherein is the peculiar dwelling-place of God.

The distinction is born out by the respective elements which either tabernacle contained. "In the first tabernacle (says the Apostle) was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread"; these were symbolical representations of Jesus Christ in the flesh. As to the candlestick, was He not the light of God come into the world? As to the shew-bread, was He not the bread of God come down from heaven? But "in the second, was the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant, overlaid round about with gold, wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant, and above it the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat". What is a censer? It is a vessel wherein incense is

Digitized by Google

offered. And what is incense? It is a compound of sweet spices; and may well be regarded as symbolical of *the breath of God.* Christ, then, in the holy of holies, *gives forth of His spirit thence,* for the benefit of His Church. Again, what is the ark of the covenant? What, but Jesus Christ as containing in Himself all that is essential to constitute the Church of God in glory. The ark, we are told, contained the pot of manna. Here there is the *better bread, the bread from heaven,* whereof, if a man eat, he shall have life for ever. Also Aaron's rod! Was it not a *symbol of reviving again* from a state of death, and so pointing to a new life out of death. All this applied to Jesus Christ, who gave life to a dead humanity. The tables of the covenant had on them the law of God, written with the finger of God: well, *from heaven beams forth the divine principles* for the instruction of mankind, principles which pervade the dwelling-place of God. The cherubim of glory are also there; that is, *glorious spirits are there,* penetrating into, and observing the divine economy established there. The mercy seat is also there; indicating *the divine beneficence* on all recovered ones, and shewing how God can complacently receive those who once were defiled, but now are cleansed from sin. And the blood of atonement is there, a blood shed on all around, as indicative of *the true life* of God, the holy character of Christ. The material *blood of victims* had been offered in the Holy Place, as the intimation of sin sacrificed, and of sin slain: the *holy blood,* however, of the High Priest, is offered in the Holy of Holies; the former being a metonymy of death *(the death of sin),* the latter being the metonymy of life *(the life of righteousness).* Both tabernacles, then, in the first

Digitized by Google

place, apply to Jesus Christ: the former as He underwent the experiences of this life: the latter as He has passed into the immediate presence of the Father.

Let us see, then, whether we have a consistent scheme of thought, as touching this "greater and more perfect tabernacle," in which Jesus Christ has ultimately presented Himself. I think the tabernacle, spoken of in the text, must needs be referred to the body of Christ. First of all, there can be no doubt that our blessed Lord spoke of His body, as a tabernacle or temple. For instance, He said, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up in three days"; but we are told "He spoke of the temple of His body". Can there be a doubt, however, that He hereby connected the temple-service which was rendered by the priesthood in the holy place with the service which He was now rendering in the body of the flesh? The one was emblematical of the other, and the destruction of the one was symbolical of the destruction of the other. And what is it which Christ here intimates? He intimates that, though the temple of God in His person should, as an earthly thing, be destroyed, yet He had in Himself a temple made without hands, that could be manifested in three days.

The Apostles were accustomed to speak of man's body in similar terms. "Know ye not (says Paul) that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God?" It behoved man, therefore, to preserve his body from profane uses; for such uses were called "sinning against his own body"; and the threat of God was denounced on such, in these words:—"If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is

Digitized by Google

holy, which temple ye are". And again he says:— "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for we are the temple of the living God, even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people". All this indicates that the body is an object of sanctification, a temple which has to be purified. And as we proceed into deeper details, we come to find that the purification consists in the destruction of the flesh, *i.e.*, of fleshly lusts, while we hereby bring into bolder relief "that hidden man of the heart," which, by the way, cannot be manifested in its exclusiveness, so long as "the outward man" has its consistency and power on the earth; but, nevertheless, we are assured that "each several building (thus universally established and fitly framed together) groweth into a holy temple in the Lord, for a habitation of God in the Spirit".

The Apostles also use the word "tabernacle" as well as "temple," as symbolical of the body. For example, St. Peter says, "I think it meet, so long as I am in *this tabernacle*, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off *this my tabernacle*, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me". Paul also says, "If *the earthly house of our tabernacle* be dissolved (*i.e.*, if our present bodily frame be dissolved), we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens". This latter text intimates a great deal to us: it intimates in so many words that there is a second tabernacle for us; and it is clearly implied that "the second tabernacle is not manifested to us while the first tabernacle is still standing". We have all experience of our present bodily structure, but we have no direct experience of a

Digitized by Google

second and more refined bodily structure. This, for the present, is a matter of faith to us, and it becomes matter of faith because it is so clearly revealed to us.

We see the first tabernacle now; we feel it: we are conscious of it: its conditions constitute the very foundations of our selfhood; for our selfhood is formed on the very basis of its character as a constitution, and of its agency as the medium of communication. We do not now see the inner man. We can only entertain the idea of it. We can draw analogies from nature respecting it. Such analogies (we think) are found in the outer shell of the nut in connection with the inner cuticle which surrounds the core or kernel of the nut. The soul then has an outer side, and an inner essence, while moreover there is the outer shell or body which has to die and pass away. The outer shell, as we have termed it, is the material body, which is essential in a material world for the growth of the soul. The soul itself however has what may be regarded as its own outer coating which connects it with the material side of things, and its inner essence which as intellectualism is characterised simply by the attribute of consciousness. If the soul had not a side which connects it with the material body, it could have no communication with the body. We know as a fact that it has constant communication with the body: we know that it is receiving impressions constantly through the body: we know that it is through the body, that it obtains all its ideas of the external world. We are taught that as the electric wire, wherein a current has been established, carries the impress made at its one terminus faithfully, and at once, to the other terminus, so the nerve that is attached to the eye carries the im-

Digitized by Google

press of colours and shapes, and the nerve that is attached to the ear carries the impress of sounds, and the nerve that is attached to the nostrils carries the impress of odours, and so on; in like manner though in more refined fashion, there is reported at the centre of the soul's operation what we call the cognisance of these impressions. And if so, there must needs be a side of the soul far more refined indeed than ordinary matter, yet allied to matter, so as to take on the impressions of matter, yet in point of fact standing as a go-between real matter and the inner conscious essence of the soul.

It is this go-between, that constitutes the foundation of that spiritual body, which is yet to be developed, when our outer and material body shall have died, and become dissipated. It is this go-between, as the objective side of soul, which is allied on the one hand to the material side of man, and on the other hand to the absolutely immaterial side of man, as the purely subjective side of soul;—it is this go-between that will be developed into a new body in the celestial sphere, where a future and regenerated humanity will have its activities manifested. It is the formation of this go-between, that really constitutes the fundamental organisation of the soul for a future state. The formation thereof takes place under the discipline of the gospel, and the qualities of Jesus Christ as revealed in the gospel, with which that formation is constituted, form the fundamental conditions of an immortalised soul. In the exercise of faith the soul has a consciousness of the spiritual conditions thus imparted to it; there can be no doubt therefore that the conditions under which the soul is to stand in the great future, are attained *now*. If they be conditions representing mere worldly elements, without

Digitized by Google

regard to the righteousness of these elements, they cannot abide, they have no basis of immortality; and for the simple reason, that the world as such cannot give a permanency which it does not itself possess.

True it is, that the impressions as made on the soul must be regarded as made on an imperishable ground,—a ground that is intrinsically eternal, because essentially indestructible, but it does not follow hence, that the impressions made thereupon, and therefore constituting special or individual formations, become thereby perpetuated as formations. We have reason to suppose that all matter, for example, is built upon an indestructible ground (the ether), in virtue of which it functions or fulfils its laws according to the limitations prescribed; and functions too by its characteristic qualities, out of which indeed we must needs have the forces of the world; but we all know, and see that these qualities are destructible, that is capable of being disannulled or dissolved. In like manner there is no reason to suppose that mere worldly elements, as an impress on the soul, will constitute its immortality. Hence we would infer, that a soul simply made up of worldly elements,—elements that do not lead to the acquisition of the life that lies in the bosom of God,—elements that do not lead to the cognition of God, or combine in them such an idea of God, as to link the soul with something, that is with laws, which essentially constitute the very foundation of the immortality, that necessarily belongs to God, could be otherwise than perishable. It is on this ground, that we argue for the perishableness of all mere animal natures. They have nothing in them that contains the very foundations of beinghood, in a sphere that is essentially everlasting.

Digitized by Google

What then, it may fairly be asked, constitutes the grounds of human immortality? The Apostle answers "this is life eternal to know the only true God and Jesus Christ". To know the only true God! This implies an impress of His "being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth". This impress we have in the knowledge of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ gave forth to the world a true representation of God,—such a representation, as it is possible for the world to receive. He had God revealed in Himself, and in the acquisition therefore of Christ, we obtain what properly constitute the foundations of immortality. "He that hath seen Me (He says) hath seen the Father." "God alone hath immortality:" we therefore must have something of God, in order to be partakers of immortality. Of what then must we be partakers in order to inherit immortality? We must know that "God is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him". We must know that the law of God is righteousness, and we must feel the power of His righteousness; and this knowledge implies that sin which is hateful to God, must be crushed through Him; and therefore it constitutes an operative influence in keeping us from sin. These are the true grounds of immortality. The grounds of immortality indeed may be said to lie in the possession and application of true and elevated moral law. I say *true moral law*, because there is a right and a wrong which indicate the fact of morals, but which is not true moral law. The savage may have, and does have, his notions of right and of wrong, but these are founded upon false knowledge, that is upon the acquisition of false principles; and false principles can have no proper foundation and no proper permanence.

Digitized by Google

Christ says that He is "the Truth" and because He is "the Truth," therefore He is "the Life". If we have "the truth as it is in Jesus;" then shall we have the life; *i.e.*, the immortality which belongs to Jesus.

But this brings us back to the question from which we have diverged, *viz.*, the tabernacle which is equipped for immortality, and which shall stand forth in the permanence of God, when the present tabernacle shall have been dissolved. It is obvious in the first place that the soul of man is formed in immediate connection with his birth-state into this world. Were there no birth of humanity as a living body; there could be no soul-birth of humanity. The soul of man comes into manifestation with the body of man; and though it is of a consistency different from the body, in as far as it is far more refined than the body; yet, as I have said, it has a kind of outside allied to the body, while it is internally and essentially a cognising power—a power which yields the consciousness of the impressions which it receives. This is its knowledge, and its knowledge constitutes the furniture of its being: and when the knowledge consists of the great truths, which belong to God,—such as have been manifested to man by Jesus Christ, and when these great truths are compacted as the soul's membership, in righteous subordination, they constitute, so far as they go, the image of Christ and therefore the impress of God. The *etherial side* of the soul, that side which stands in immediate connection with our bodies, is the basis of the future body—the ground which is brought under the intellectual cognition: the *Cognitive* side of the soul is the crowning glory of its being. The body of the Lord Jesus therefore is transferred to us now when

Digitized by Google

we have the application of Christ made to us by the teaching and discipline of the gospel.

Now here is the distinction betwixt souls formed with the impress of Christ, and those having the impress of error, that the former will stand as having those qualitative conditions that belong to God and that cannot be destroyed; while the latter cannot stand, in that it has qualities which have no essential permanence in them, qualities that go to dissolution, when the test of their permanence is applied. Hence that which constitutes the spirit-body of the Lord Jesus—that body which is glorified, must be looked for in the etherial side of the soul new formed with the impress of the Divine righteousness, that is with the qualities which God hath ordained to live and stand for ever in the presence of His glory, qualities which come directly from His own bosom, and which therefore are an image of God Himself. This then is what is called "the second Tabernacle".

I rather think that Peter refers to this second tabernacle when he says that Christians are built up "a spiritual house"; and further that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews embraces the same view when he says, "We are the house of Christ, if we hold fast the confidence and glorying of our hope firm unto the end". Christ is called "the chief corner stone" of Zion, *i.e.*, of the Church revealed in glory; and it is said "we shall be *like Him*, for we shall see Him as He is": that is, we shall be made "living stones" in likeness, and correspondence, and conformity to that corner stone. Let it be observed that, as regards the present bodily man, "the outward man" of the flesh, there is no noticeable distinction, whether we be followers of Christ or otherwise: that particular part of our manhood is always the

Digitized by Google

same. If then we consider that the soul under all circumstances has an "inner manhood," or is an inner manhood, constituted so as to have always a formation, according to the knowledge and moral conditions, under which its knowledge is framed: if, farther, we consider that the mind of Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, has not only the knowledge of God, *i.e.*, of God's principles, but that knowledge put together under the highest moral harmony; we, who have the mind of Christ, and, consequently, have therewith the principles of Christ in true harmony with God, must needs in that case have an inner formation characterised by the qualities of Christ, and these qualities conjoined in true and happy relationship to one another, so that their action or operation shall be in conformity to those of Christ, and so be in circumstances to dwell with God and to be glorified.

In this state, then, there is the formation of an etherial body thus conditioned, and that etherial body gives to the inner intellectualism the consciousness of its own states. But what is this but the formation of "the inner man" in *the image of Christ?* And what is this but partaking of the body and blood of Christ? And what is this but the spiritual body and the spiritual life which pertains to the purely celestial state? "There is a spiritual body (says S. Paul), and there is a natural body." And again, "there are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial". And he further tells us, that, while our bodies are sown or begotten as natural or terrestrial bodies, we, who are the children of the resurrection, shall be raised spiritual or celestial bodies. That which comes first is not spiritual, but that which is natural. While the natural

Digitized by Google

has its own life, and giveth its own life to the soul, it also supplies the possibility of obtaining the graft of the spiritual, through its channels of instruction, in as far as in the midst of carnal things, there may be, and is, the ministration of spiritual things. And as I have said, it is by this ministration of spiritual things—the things of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, that there is built up a personality, that is, a spiritual house of the soul invisibly—a spiritual house, therefore, not made with hands—a house that shall be adapted for heaven, and become eternal in the heavens, as possessing the indestructible qualities of God. Hence this house is properly said to be the body of the Lord Jesus Christ—a body that shall remain after the house of our present tabernacle shall have wasted away and become dissolved for ever.

We are thus led to an economy of spiritual things, on scientific principles, as well as on scriptural principles; and we are thereby admitted to see into the meaning of the Jewish dispensation, as one of carnal ordinances pointing to spiritual things. The *two tabernacles in one* were thus a shadow of the good things to be shown thereafter. They comprehended everything else in the economy of Israel. The first tabernacle was alone prominent and familiar to the people, but then it was known to lead into a second tabernacle, which was in many respects mysterious—a tabernacle into which they were not permitted to enter—into which none under ordinary circumstances were permitted to enter—into which the high priest, as the most sacred and sanctified person, could alone enter; and even he, but at one stated season, when he could take the blood of atonement with him, as indicative of a pure and perfect

Digitized by Google

life; and could give forth that blood of atonement, as applicable for the cleansing and purification of all else.

There must have been a meaning in all this. We are taught that there was a meaning in all this: we are taught that the carnal things of this Jewish dispensation pointed to a condition of things under the christian dispensation—a condition corresponding in meaning as a still nearer development of the truths which God was in the process of communicating to man. And as Jesus Himself is directly the foundation and pattern of the christian dispensation—as out of Him springs all the peculiar properties and blessed privileges of this dispensation, so these two tabernacles must be regarded as having their primary fulfilment in Him. It will be well for us, then, to inquire what the New Testament says about *the two tabernacles in one.*

The 8th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews begins thus:—"Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum (that is, the chief point): we have such an high priest who sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, *a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man*". These latter words are of deep significance—a significance deeper than is usually ascribed to them. When Christ is spoken of as "a minister" of this or that, it is signified that He bringeth in the same, and offereth the same unto us—even things that are essential for our redemption and salvation. There is a distinction, moreover, betwixt Christ's work as "the minister of the *sanctuary*," and Christ's work as "the minister of the *true tabernacle*". Christ's work as minister of "the sanctuary" has respect to the service which He rendered in the *first tabernacle* or "sanc-

Digitized by Google

tuary," *i.e.*, the outward tabernacle or body of the flesh: Christ's work, again, as minister (*i.e.*, purveyor or bestower) "of the *true tabernacle*, not made with hands, which the Lord pitched, and not man," has respect to the service which He has rendered and now renders in *the second tabernacle, i.e.*, the inner and more perfect and permanent tabernacle which is now glorified, and which He dispenses from Himself, as the revealer of a fresh spiritual life. In the former, as service was rendered among the Jews, there was the offering up of animal blood and the sacrifice of animal victims, bearing the sin of the offerers; and the slaughter of these victims and the spilling of their blood indicated the death of sin and the destruction of the life of sin, as a power that must be abolished in order to take sin out of the way, as that which is offensive to God. When, however, the blood of sin was thus poured out, and the life of sin was thus slain, and the offence of sin was thus removed, there was a life remaining, a life untainted, and, therefore, a blood spared, which was properly regarded as the type of a remanent life—a blood which was regarded as holy blood, and, therefore, peculiarly sacred; and with that holy blood, the high priest on the great day of atonement was permitted to enter the more immediate presence of God to minister in the second tabernacle, and to give forth this blood by sprinkling on the tokens of heavenly things all round. Thereby all things were regarded as sanctified or vivified by bedewing them with His sacred blood. How does all this comport with what is applicable to Jesus Christ?

Christ came into our world in a tabernacle of human flesh: He was incarnated in a human body, and it

Digitized by Google

behoved Him to present Himself as a sacrifice to God therein. I say it *behoved* Him so to do. We do not sufficiently take into account the great fact, that, from the very beginning of man's creation, it was the requirement of God in joining His Spirit, that is, in making the law of the Holy Spirit the law of the soul of man, in the earthly paradise—I say it was the requirement of God from the beginning, and, therefore, incumbent on man from the day he stood forth thus equipped, to observe the law of sacrifice. The foundations of sacrifice, I say, lie in the very fact of man's creation with a body full of carnal emotions. There must needs be a limit placed to the indulgence of carnal emotions; and that limit can be placed effectively only by the authoritative power of God working by His Holy Spirit. This was the condition in which man was placed, when God closed His work of creation. Had man been planted a mere denizen of the earth, then the tendency had been for man to indulge himself without spiritual restraint. But man was not designed for the earth ultimately. When, therefore, man was created, there was a restraint laid upon his carnal appetite. He had to deny himself thereto, and this in obedience to the higher law of the Holy Spirit, brought authoritatively to work upon him. It was in this way only that a due restriction could be placed, as had to be placed, for man's own good, and for the good of the world, on human thought and on human action.

But what was this restriction in the days of what is called his innocency? It was the imposition of self-denial. *And what was this self-denial but the law of sacrifice, as the foundation of true human life in the world?* The law of sacrifice then lay at the foundation

Digitized by Google

of a true human life; for it was indispensable that the law of the flesh, as the animal governing power, should yield to the law of the Spirit, as the all-authoritative governing power appointed by God; or if not, it followed that the Spirit must be lost to the soul of man, in which case man must remain a creature of carnal impulses, and, therefore, a creature wholly unfitted for a spiritual sphere. What I say, then, is this, that it behoved Christ Jesus to submit to the law of sacrifice, in being clothed with the human body, the body of our flesh and blood.

Not a little has been already said on this subject. Many efforts have been made to shew that the body with which Christ came into this world was not the body of our fallen nature, but a body corresponding to that which Adam had before the fall—that He did not come "in the likeness of sinful flesh," as saith the Apostle Paul, but in the sameness of Adam's body at the creation; but what signifies the difference? Adam's body at the creation, like every other animal body, had of necessity its cravings and its emotions, as the law of human desires upon the earth, and these cravings could be regulated and sufficiently controlled only by the Spirit of God given to him; and if they were not, it is evident, in that case, that the flesh got the better of the Spirit. What, therefore, was the object of Christ in taking the human frame? It was this, *viz.*, to shew that the Spirit of God might rule triumphant in him, and, consequently, that the law of the Divine Creator for man was a good and holy law as a law of restraint, a law which was necessary to prepare men for a higher abode than man enjoyed or could enjoy by remaining on the earth. This fact had not as yet received its full

Digitized by Google

realization in the world; and Christ came to show that the law under which man was created was "holy, and just, and good"—a law under which man might be redeemed from the power of the flesh, and established while upon the earth, as a spiritually minded subject, while yet surrounded and beset by carnal influences.

What was all this but *the abrogation of the first tabernacle* as essential to the manifestation of *the second tabernacle?* There was no proper entrance into the second tabernacle, and, therefore, no possible manifestion of the second tabernacle, while the first was still standing. So we are told. And we are taught that the first tabernacle of the body must be broken down, in order to the manifestation of the second.

The Jewish temple, as the outer sanctuary of God, and emblematic of the outer man, has been broken down: Christ foretold that "not one stone should be left upon another, but that all should be thrown down," demolished. What does all this betoken? It betokens the absolute destruction of the outer man, the tabernacle of the body, which we have here below upon the earth. What then? Is the temple of God destroyed? No! there is another temple "made without hands eternal in the heavens". We do not see the temple in the heavens, *i.e.*, the Holy of Holies in glory; but Christ will come with that glorious inner tabernacle, as the personification of our glorified humanity in the heavenly state. We do not now see the glorified body of which we shall become partakers when we reach the celestial state, but the germs of that body are in us now, and with us now; and it will come into operative manifestation, when we shall be transferred to that celestial sphere for which such a body is adapted.

Digitized by Google

Christ has already developed in His own person the true tabernacle, the tabernacle that shall live and be permanent. It consists in the possession of that heavenly body which He has carried with Him into glory. What then is the fact? It is this, that Christ has created a new and perfect manhood, that He has carried that new and perfect manhood into the presence of the Father—a manhood, on the one hand divested of the outward sheathing of the material body, and on the other hand, invested with the inner qualities, and form, and adjustments of the spiritual body. The former, as we are told, cannot go to heaven: for flesh and blood, as we now have it, are perishable material, and hence "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," as S. Paul says. The latter, however, is adapted for heaven: for there are "bodies celestial," as well as "bodies terrestrial"; there are "bodies spiritual," as well as "bodies material"; and the bodies spiritual can alone inhabit the realms of celestial light. In the material tabernacle, we have sacrifices to render (*e.g.*, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life"), and when we have rendered these, the tabernacle in which we render them, decays and passes away. It is in the passing away of the first tabernacle, *i.e.*, when the vail of the outer man is rent in twain, and all obstruction is thereby removed, that the way into the Holiest of all is made manifest; for we then stand panoplied in a robe of righteousness, and are prepared for ascension to the right hand of God in glory. Thus, then, we have the true tabernacle which the Lord hath pitched, and not man—the tabernacle which cannot be dissolved; which has life in it—a life which cannot die; life! one and

Digitized by Google

the same with that which Jesus holds, and with which He has entered into glory.

How hath the Lord Jesus achieved this tabernacle for us? He hath "taken away the first that He may establish the second". He hath abolished a dispensation of carnal things that He may establish a dispensation of spiritual things: If Jesus has personally entered on the dispensation of spiritual things He has sat down with a spiritual body at the right hand of the Father; and this, after He had endured the sacrificial life in this present world. His whole life here was to Him a dispensation of sacrifice—a dispensation which was preliminary and preparatory to the dispensation on which He has now entered, and entered as our Fore-runner and Saviour. The former was analogous to that under which we now live. We now live to fulfil the meaning and intention of Old Testament sacrifices. Christ in His day upon the earth did so, and did so perfectly and satisfactorily. Having finished His course on earth, He left us an example of life, that "we should walk in His steps," and an encouragement in dying to this life, that, like Him, we should live spiritually, and hereafter ascend to the mansions of celestial life.

The Christian Church, then, as the mystical body of Christ at this day, stands in the very position in which Christ stood upon the earth. This is the day of its sacrificial life. We who belong to the Christian Church are now in the outer tabernacle, and we ought to be sacrificing in the outer tabernacle. There can be no greater mistake entertained, than that we professing christians have no sacrifices to render; and that because Christ has rendered an all-sufficient sacrifice, therefore we are absolved. We have to fulfil in our own persons

Digitized by Google

the life of sacrifice taught in the Old Testament, as Christ fulfilled the life of sacrifice. The Old Testament prescribed the *lessons* by means of animal victims: we have to *learn* the lessons by means of the sacrifice of Christ, and put them into practice in our own persons. As Jesus was in the world for this end, so are we in the christian world for this end. Jesus was "the end of the law"—the purpose, meaning, and intention of the law, in the fulfilment of Old Testament lessons: He practically carried them out, in His own person, as the head and forerunner of a coming generation, who should be "conformed to His death"; and now He hath entered into the bright presence of the Father, where He serveth in the second tabernacle. The sphere which He occupied on the earth, and the work which He then inaugurated, we His followers now do occupy; and He puts us into the position and the capacity of fulfilling and carrying on the work which said sphere demands. Our position now is, therefore, to learn the lessons of the sacrificial life of the first tabernacle, and to apply them in respect of the self-denial we have to exercise on this our body. What was practised upon victims in the Old Testament, we have now to practise upon ourselves; and this is the most unwelcome theology—a theology which is exceedingly distasteful to the natural heart of man—a theology which alarms those who think that all needful sacrifice has been done by Christ in substitution for us, because they have never entertained the idea that any sacrifices are necessary on our part—a theology which lays upon them a new and fresh responsibility, a responsibility they would much rather not undertake, as bringing on personal pains and penalties in the upgiving of sin—a theology which repudiates the doctrine

Digitized by Google

of substitution, in that it embraces the lesson that "the soul that sinneth *it* shall die," and which disclaimeth the idea that one can be admitted to die for another in the great question of sin, as if it could in reason be any satisfaction, that the death of a substitute could take away the prevailing sin of another. The causality here affirmed is utterly incongruous. The lessons of the Old Testament, Christ fulfilled with entirest completeness; and the great vantage ground *we* have, is that these lessons have not only been set before us in the personal sacrifices of Christ, so that we may have these, but we are privileged to apply them after His example and according to His teaching, that we may become one with Himself. All this indicates the work which we have to do in the first tabernacle. It is sad if we have failed to apprehend this: it is sad for the Church of Christ, if we have yet to learn this, the fundamental lesson of Christ.

How did Christ pull down and destroy the temple of His body? First of all, He permitted it to have no dominion in the soul. This was the first portion of His sacrificial work. The sacrifices were made in His temple, while yet the temple externally was permitted to stand. The Jewish temple was itself a type of the bodily temple. In the Jerusalem-temple there was an assemblage of corrupt things which had to be cast out—corrupt things brought in by the Jews themselves; and Jesus assumed the prerogative and the power of *casting them out.* This He did when "He made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew their tables, and said to them that sold doves —'Take these things hence, make not My Father's

Digitized by Google

house a house of merchandise'". And is there not in the temple of our body an assemblage of corrupt things which have to be *cast out*—corrupt things brought in by the wicked one, and fostered and maintained by ourselves for our worldly profit and gratification. There is "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life,"—all which have their foundation in the temple of the body. "The lust of the flesh" has reference to the gratification of carnal appetites: "the lust of the eye" has reference to the indulgence of the things of sense: "the pride of life" to the acquisition of worldly place and power. All these betray a man into sin, in as far as they keep the affections centred on material objects, which of themselves do not belong to the spiritual Kingdom of God, and are, therefore, "unclean things" in the service of the temple. In as far, therefore, as these things obstruct the service of God, or come between the soul and the service of God, they are to be cast out. They are to be cast out, because nothing earthly should come between the soul and its service of God. Hence Christ says, "Whoso loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me; whoso loveth son or daughter more than Me, is not worthy of Me; yea, whoso loveth His own life more than Me, is not worthy of Me". All must be put aside for the sake of Christ, all sublunary objects, however precious, must be kept aloof from the soul, if these come between us and the love of Christ, or usurp those affections which ought to be given to Christ, or if in any way the love of them doth alienate us from Christ.

Now, what are all earthly loves? What, but loves founded in the affections of the bodily economy. The corruptions, therefore, which are found in this bodily

Digitized by Google

temple of ours, are to be cast out. Christ had our body, and therewith He had the experiences which we have: "He had the feeling of our infirmities". What then? He cast them out. No one ever exercised self-denial as He did. "He stripped Himself of the principalities and powers" which rule over us. So says S. Paul. But let us hear Himself. "Behold (He says), I cast out devils and do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected." He was "made perfect" as to the discipline which He had to undergo, when, under the awful tortures of the cross, He offered up His body to the last penalty which it could undergo.

We, in like manner, have to undergo the same penalty, in order to our healing. We have first to cast out the devils wherewith we are encompassed—"fornication and all uncleanness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like"; and finally we have to resign the body itself to death, as a power that shall no longer subsist to prompt the soul to carnal things. What then? Why this must come to pass, that, if while this material body is our home, we have been enabled to sacrifice the evils which its presence brings, and to be no longer the slaves of its dominion, then, when the soul, thus freed from its earthly tabernacle, stands clothed simply in the frame of spirit-nature, as formed or moulded by Christ, and enters the atmosphere of a spiritual kingdom, it shall have only the tastes and tendencies of that spirit-nature, and live and move in harmony with Jesus Christ.

What follows from all this? This, assuredly that the destruction of the first tabernacle opens up the way to the manifestation of the second. As Christ was, so are

Digitized by Google

we now upon the earth. He hath pulled down the tabernacle which He had upon the earth; and having pulled it down, He hath set up and shewn another tabernacle in the heavens. This is what we have to do: this is what He hath enabled us to do. The first and most emphatic teaching of the New Testament is to intimate that "they who are in the flesh cannot please God"; for "to be carnally minded is death," in that it is alienation from God, and from Jesus Christ, the source of life. If carnal mindedness then arises from the conditions of the body of the flesh, with its peculiar cravings as being imposed upon the soul, the very beginnings of spiritual mindedness, or rather the necessary preliminary to spiritual mindedness, is to get quit of the carnal power. This demands self-denial; and the self-denial is neither more nor less than sacrifice. We here "present our bodies a living sacrifice to God"; and when we look to Heaven as our home, and to the assurance that a soul filled with mere carnal things cannot go to Heaven, such sacrifice is a most "reasonable service". As it has been with Christ then, so it comes to be with us. Christ was once known "after the flesh," *i.e.*, as one who had the tabernacle of our human flesh, "yet (says S. Paul) He is henceforth known in this condition no longer". The tabernacle in which He offered sacrifice for sin is removed, He hath another and greater and more perfect tabernacle which hath been raised up and glorified, as the Holy of Holies. And it is said, that "the Lord shall change this our vile body (or rather the body of our humiliation) that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, by that mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself".

Digitized by Google

And what is all this change which is effected, but a true atonement made unto God for sin? Atonement is neither more nor less than the taking away of sin, and the bringing in of a pure and perfect righteousness; atonement simply means restoration—that is the taking away of the offence on the one hand and the inbringing of true virtue on the other hand. Such restoration is all the indemnity which God demands; such restoration is an entire vindication of the integrity of God, in that it proclaims that hereby the offence, as a state of guilt, is removed; and that the law of righteousness which is alone holy and just and good for Heaven is established for ever. God requires nothing more; and He will have nothing less. The offence, which is sin must be taken out of the way, and *then* and only then it is, that God can pardon, that is extend His mercifulness and release from punishment for sins past: and not only pardon, but vouchsafe gratuitously, which He is pleased to do, the righteousness which is the true law of His own giving.

The foundation of a full and perfect atonement, was made by the Lord Jesus; and it is obvious that this could have been fundamentally established by Him alone. It was established by the very fact, that He took what is essentially and intrinsically ours. Had this been otherwise, His work had been foreign to our needs. It was by taking what is ours that He having the Divine nature, was able to operate on what is ours, to purge and to purify what is ours, and to bring in, what we by ourselves have no means of introducing, a perfect righteousness upon the soul, as the motive power of will and of action. This could be effected in one way only, *viz.*, by spilling the blood of the body of sin, that is by destroying the foundations of sin in the

Digitized by Google

human constitution of flesh; and this he did effectually; "He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself". Yet He had His own precious and heavenly life on the soul —a life which became developed in the spirit-body which shewed itself, when the body of sin was destroyed,—a life which shewed itself as the heart of that second or more spiritual tabernacle, which belonged to Him, when He rose from the dead, and which became glorified, when He ascended therewith to the mansions of the Father.

See then how the whole matter stands. Christ had first to accomplish that personal service in the first tabernacle of the flesh, which as one made subject to the challenge of the Divine law, it behoved Him to render, in order to fulfil the demands of a perfect atonement for sin. Having done this, He went with the blood of the true tabernacle, that is with the life of the pure and permanent spiritual body, into the most holy presence of God; that is, He ascended to Heaven with *His own* blood,—the life of the Spirit of God, as the life of the new manhood, after the earthly manhood had been slain, and deprived of its own blood; and there He stood with acceptance before the Father, and there He received the acclamations of angels. Here then was realised a manhood no longer in possession of the blood of its former earthly existence, but as having been deliberately and overtly deprived of the same as a blood, and therefore as a life, which could not by possibility enter heaven, nor enjoy heaven, yet in truth furnished with new blood, the spirit-blood of God Himself, as the true life of the celestial state. And this sacred blood was manifested in what is called the second tabernacle, the tabernacle of glory.

Now observe: this new life, as applied to the manhood

Digitized by Google

of Christ, was not brought about for Himself alone, but as the solid foundation and type of a corresponding life to be built up thereupon. As the Eternal Spirit, with which Christ Jesus was furnished without measure, effected in His own person the casting forth from the temple of the body all things offending; so the self same spirit, after the exhibition of the process of redemption and salvation in His own person had been effected and discharged, was through Him and from Him revealed to the world, and revealed as the power by which alone redemption could be similarly obtained for the world. When Christ came with the new manhood to the skies, His position was to bestow the covenant-relationship between Him and the Father, as follows—'Now let Me obtain for *men* in general what I have obtained for that manhood which I assumed through woman, and which I have purified and prepared and perfected for glory: it will be for the honour of God, that my body should be enlarged and extended, and the power of God should be similarly applied for the regeneration of many'.

What must needs be done in those circumstances? We find that Christ Jesus before He left the earth had gathered together a few who were so far instructed by Him, who had confidence in His name, who had received promises of fresh instruction after His departure, to whom therefore a full revelation by the Holy Ghost was vouchsafed of all that Jesus taught, that is, of all which constituted the true life of Jesus upon the earth, that is, of the spirit of wisdom and of might in Jesus, as the Sacrificer of sin and the Manifestor of righteousness; and this living power of the Spirit, properly called "the precious blood of Christ," the life-power of His constitution as a glorified manhood, was shed forth in

Digitized by Google

fulness to the Church which He had founded, that it might be dispensed by the Church unto the world for its regeneration.

Christ then having completed the service of the sanctuary upon the earth, there was nothing more to be done therein, its purpose had been accomplished and hence destruction awaited it. The body of the flesh was put out of the way. The outer sanctuary having fulfilled its sacrificial existence, He goes in the inner sanctuary, manifesting the work of sacrifice which had been achieved; and He is received as "the King of glory" and the all-prevailing "Priest of the Most High God". The blood of the first sanctuary was material blood indicating the death of material life; and the sacrifice became *the consummation in His case of a dispensation of carnal ordinances*, and consequently the removal of the very basis of sin's dominion in the soul. The blood of the second sanctuary was the life of God in the soul of man, the life that had been imparted to the soul-manhood of the Lord Jesus, the life therefore which displayed itself in Jesus, as His sole and exclusive life,—as the harmony of the human with the Divine, the life therefore of the new dispensation introduced by Christ, and which has been called "the blood of the New Covenant," as the animating power of the spiritual dispensation, under which we have the privilege to live. This it is which gives vividness to the inner tabernacle on which the soul's foundations are laid, and this with the qualities attached to it, gives to said tabernacle a character which is allied to, or in conformity with the inner or spirit-body of the Lord Jesus, that body which has been raised from the dead, and which has been glorified in the Heavens.

Digitized by Google

Such is the tenor and substance (as we gather it) of the New Testament dispensation, in order to the foundation of the new life, "the life of God in the soul of man". The essentials of it are sometimes spoken of as "the water of life," and as "the water of the fountain of life," as "the river of life," as "living water," and so forth; and sometimes as "the spirit," "the spirit of life," "the spirit of holiness," "the spirit of grace," "the spirit of truth," "the spirit of wisdom," "the spirit of God," "the spirit of Christ," and "the things of the Spirit," "in opposition to the things of the flesh;" and sometimes it is "the blood," "the blood that cleanseth," as "Christ's blood of the New Testament," "the blood that maketh white," "the blood of the everlasting covenant," "the blood that redeems," the blood which is "*Christ's own*" as distinguished from the blood of the flesh which was *ours*, and which was shed on the cross, and is called "the blood of the cross," which blood we may not drink and cannot drink; but we are called to be "partakers of the precious blood of Christ," spoken of as "the blood of a lamb without spot, and without blemish". But whichever term is employed, whether "the water, the spirit, or the blood," we are expressly taught that the meaning is the same. So says John. "There are three" (that is three as pointing to these separate terms)—"there are three that bear witness on earth (witness to regeneration)—the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." In one what? Surely in one meaning, in one signification, in one purpose or finding. *Water* is the most common of all instrumentalities; and its universal property is that of cleansing: Hence "the washing of water with the word" implies cleansing. Again, the *spirit* is a name in

Digitized by Google

Scripture, denoting the animating power of God, given to promote Divine purity; and wherever the Spirit of God is spoken of, as applied to man, there the purifying power of God is implied, for the cleansing of the soul. And again, the *blood* of the creature is the life of the creature; and the pouring out of the blood is an indication of the destruction of the life. If therefore the creature-life is one of sin, the shedding of its blood must be the destruction of the life of sin. In the same way, the impartation of blood is of necessity the impartation of life; and if the life of the party spoken of is that of purity and of righteousness, it follows as a thing of course, that the impartation of the blood in these circumstances is the impartation of the animating power of righteousness. In this way then, we see how true it is, that, as John says, the *three* terms have one and the same significance in Scripture. They indicate the things of Jesus as made ours, and consequently that the motive power which operated in the bosom of Jesus, has been made ours—a motive power which coming from God, lies at the foundation of will, and consequently gives to man's will an incitement as from God, and in harmony with God.

We know then what this incitement is. It is an incitement which is antagonistic to sin, because it is the pure spring of all righteousness. It lies primarily and fundamentally in the bosom of God, as the natural outcome of His own possession of all truth; and as the fundamental spring of all spiritual thought and action. The word of God is the animating power of God. How it may be asked are we trained and disciplined? Is it not by the use of words? The judicious parent moulds the disposition of his child by tending and by training;

Digitized by Google

and thereby he conforms the plastic soul of his child to be in harmony with his own; what does he thereby do, but impart his own life to the soul of his child? A teacher is employed to give instruction on some subject, no matter what. When the child receives said instruction, he is animated in that field by the living thoughts of his teacher. By and by the child comes to read for himself, and to gather instruction from the books he reads: if he receives these as truth, the reader becomes animated with the same spirit as the author. The living power which animated the writer as breathed by him in words is transferred to the sympathetic reader.

Now God has spoken to us by His word, and His word hath authority and remains on the soul; and His word thus fixed becomes the animating power whereby we have a transference of the mind of Christ unto us. The revelation of Jesus Christ unto us is the transmission unto us of "the mind of Christ". If we have the mind of Christ we have the animating power of Christ; we have the mental life of Christ; we have what must properly be regarded as the life-blood which constitutes the source and spring of our conscious spiritual beinghood, as instructed anew in the things of Jesus Christ. The word then is the water of life, the word is the spirit of life, the word is the blood of life. Hence, how true, that whatever these various terms imply, is denoted by "the word of God". We are said to be "sanctified by the word": "sanctify them by Thy word: Thy word is truth". We are said to be "born again by the word," "to be cleansed by the word". It is called "the word of reconciliation," that is the influence whereby we are turned from sin to holiness. The word is said to save the soul: "Receive

Digitized by Google

with meekness the engrafted word (says James) which is able to save the soul". And why is it able? The answer is because that word is the expression of the mind of God; and when engrafted, it is the transference of the mind of God, and consequently it is the impartation of the blood of God. Christ was Himself called by way of pre-eminence "the Word". "In the beginning was the Word." That is, the Father had a counterpart of Himself, in beinghood before creaturehood properly began—a counterpart, animated by the same spirit because possessing the same properties. The Divine Word therefore implies what may be called the Divine blood. What have we in the Scriptures? We have the Divine word therein, and therefore we have the Divine spirit therein, *i.e.*, we have the Divine blood therein; and we are privileged therefore in preaching the word, to sprinkle the blood of Christ upon you. We give to you what is fitted, if you will receive it, to make you living members of the body of Christ. This word is the essence of a risen Saviour, who, having fulfilled the sacrifices essential to man upon the earth, hath ascended in a body fitted for glorification, and is now as God-man glorified at the right hand of God.

It seems to me that this great subject is not yet understood as it ought to be, and as it appears to me it may be, in contemplating the analogy of Scripture. The most indefinite notions prevail as to the teaching of certain texts of Scripture; and the consequence is, that there is an unnatural forcing of them in many instances, to teach what they were not meant to teach, and do not teach. If the Scriptures, as we have them under the most careful surveillance, are the inspiration of God, then all Scripture must be in harmony with itself,

Digitized by Google

and in harmony with all fully ascertained truth; and when there is a want of harmony, there must be erroneous interpretation somewhere. What then we particularly desiderate is an interpretation of Scripture, that coincides with all other Scriptures, bearing on the question; an interpretation that will not shock our highest thoughts of the equity and wisdom of the Divine administration—an interpretation which consists with the well ascertained facts of science in the physical world. We have before us the economy offered to the Jews, wherein God instructed them in the lessons of Divine requirement; and He taught them these lessons by examples and illustrations such as they might be able to apprehend and to comprehend. What more impressive lessons could be given to them than the assurance that, when sin had been communicated to the victim by the touch of the "sinner," the creature must die, that the sin which it had received might thereby be taken out of the way and destroyed; but the foolish Jews instead of receiving all this as the teaching of God, put it for the reality of the thing signified as if the blood of animals could take away sin. It never was meant that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away human sin, or that the contamination of the creature could carry off the sin of the offerer by the touch of the offerer as a sinner; but only to teach the great lesson, that, *as the victim to which sin had been transmitted (symbolically) must be slain, in order to shew the destruction of the sin in question, so the sin as it reigned in the bosom of man must needs be slain,* in order to its abrogation from the human heart. Hence the saying "rend your hearts and not your garments and turn unto the Lord".

Digitized by Google

But are we any better than the Jews, when we are found *substituting* the death of Jesus Christ instead of *applying* it as an atonement for us? True it is that the atonement of the Lord Jesus was a real, true, valid and substantial expiation of sin, not having the shadowy import of the victims that were slain under the covenant of the law; but His atonement was no more a substitution for us, than were the victims under the law a substitution for offerer.

And the explanation is found in the fact that Christ came assuredly in *our* tabernacle—in that tabernacle in which it behoved that sacrifice should be made. His body was not only the medium of conveying all adverse influences to His soul, whether from the devil or from the world, but, as has been particularly noted, it had its own cravings whereby the soul was beset, such as appetite, desire, and other affections springing naturally from the body of the flesh. We may not question this without questioning that Christ was made man; and we know what S. John says of him who questions that Jesus has come in the flesh: "He is an anti-christ". We see from all this the very grounds on account of which He assumed our body of flesh and blood, and how it behoved Him to sacrifice the dominion naturally pertaining to the same; and we see that, in so doing, He set aside wholly the power by which sin is introduced into the soul. We see in this, therefore, a vindication of the truth that Christ "put away sin (the very foundations of sin) by the sacrifice of Himself" as presented in a tabernacle of sin.

But what then? Why, the precious spiritual life of Christ remained—the life which His soul had received from the Eternal Spirit; and that life stands embodied

Digitized by Google

in a spirit-structure of the soul; and that structure remains as the foundation of a life which cannot be extinguished, because it is essentially that which belongs to the Divine Word Himself, antecedent to incarnation. Hence the redemption and salvation of humanity is the drawing up of the human soul from the slough of sin into a pure fountain, wherein it obtains not only a washing, but also a transformation into the image of Christ, which shall endure with God to eternal ages. It is said "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is". The manifestation of Jesus Christ as He is, is that of the divine nature prevailing in the human, and, consequently, a union and communion of humanity with divinity that never can be separated. In this way, the image-work of God is produced in the human form, with indefinite multiplicity.

In what way angels were created we cannot tell, but we are told that God "maketh His angels spirits"; and in all probability they had their being antecedent to the physical creation to which man more immediately belongs. It seems as if the angelic world had been so far a preparative for a material world. The former we would regard as limitation in what might be called spirit-forms; the latter as limitation under grosser and less elastic qualities. In whatever way the forms in either case may be explained, it is obvious enough that there is an affinity betwixt them, in that the age, when materialism was introduced, was subsequent to the age when spirit-forms had their subsistence and validity. In this view, it will be obvious enough that, if in the process of creation, spiritism was the nearest offshoot from God, as a limitation out of the illimitable; and if materialism, as being a still more contracted sphere of

Digitized by Google

limitation, was the next offshoot out of spiritism, it is obvious that there is, and must be, not only an intimate connection betwixt materialism and spiritism, as there is betwixt spiritism and the primordial conditions of the Creator; but it follows that creations in materialism may supply subjects for spiritism. In other words, the functions of the bodily life in this world of ours, may lay the foundations for a spirit-life, which shall have its validity established when the material life shall have died out and passed away. We doubt not, that as regards all animal forms in this world, there is a correspondence of form in connection therewith, in the spirit-sphere; but, like the image of the face in the mirror, it has its validity or permanency no longer than while the original subsists. Hence the spirit-form is dependent on the presence of the matter-form. What then is it which gives to the spirit-form a basis of subsistence, when the material form shall have died and departed? We can only reply the fact that, in its origin, it has the impartations which come as from God. This seems to me to be the law of immortality: this would seem to be the ground on which the spirit-form is fixed and enduring—the ground, therefore, on which the spirit-form admits of glorification.

Hence the acquisition of the mind of Christ must needs constitute in us the foundation of the body of Christ. We become partakers of the body of Christ when our souls are instructed in the doctrine and discipline of Christ, that is, we acquire the true tabernacle—that which shall remain—that which constitutes us "children of the resurrection". The spirit-body of Christ is thus dependent on the mind of Christ. Without the body of Christ, as the second tabernacle spiritually applied to us,

Digitized by Google

we can have no permanency of being, for that permanency of being depends on the instruction in divine things which we have received. We acquire the true tabernacle, then, under the teaching and discipline of the christian dispensation. True it is, that said teaching may be perverted; in which case, we fall into what is called the state of "unclean spirits". This condition, however, can arise only after our regeneration. Regeneration is the separation of the soul from the service of the flesh, to the fulfilment of the righteousness of God; and in this case, the body of Christ is formed within; but if this regeneration should come to be perverted, then the immortality which flows from regeneration, comes to be perverted, and we fall, in that case, into the category of devils.

From what has been said, it will follow that we carry with us the germ of our resurrection-bodies now, as the disciples of the Lord Jesus.

What an unspeakable privilege have we in the assurance that the body of our humiliation, that is, the body which brings our humiliation upon us, after it hath fulfilled its end, as a medium of communication to the soul, as well as a source of institution for the soul—and after it shall have been discharged from holding dominion over the soul, by the suppression of its ordinances, as the demands of the flesh before the soul—what a privilege that this outer body of ours shall utterly pass away, and be supplanted by a spirit-body, that shall live and reign with its glorified and glorious Master in the eternity of ages.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

"Verily, verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." —JOHN xii. 24, 25.

THERE is here the illustration of a great and all-important doctrine, taken from what is known to happen in the natural world; and at the back of this statement, the great doctrine of sacrifice is itself proclaimed as binding and abiding in the moral world. The source of all moral doctrine, in its *soundest* aspect, is to be traced to the Lord Jesus Christ. If it be true that the maxim here propounded is binding on the disciples of Christ, we shall find that it is a maxim first practically carried out in the person of Christ Himself. Christ never laid upon His followers any burden which He did not first Himself bear. That the words at the head of this chapter have their application to Christ is evident enough from the context in which it stands immediately connected—"And Jesus answered them saying, the hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified". He always spake of His glorification as coming through the death He had to undergo. Death was to Him the

Digitized by Google

passage to glory. Hence the words—"Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son". And again, when the actual work of the traitor began, and He was about to be delivered into the hands of His bloodthirsty enemies, He exclaimed, "Now is the Son of Man glorified". That ordeal had approached which should terminate the series of life-trials which were allotted to Him in humiliation; and then would He triumph over all His foes, and His reign would begin in glory.

Christ had not concealed from His disciples the self-denying doctrine which He here proclaims. When He chose the twelve to be His Apostles, He propounded terms of discipleship, which were awfully severe, as touching the feelings of the natural man. His words are these—"He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me. He that taketh not his cross and followeth after Me, is not worthy of Me. He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." It is obvious that this self-abnegating doctrine, so emphatically preached by Christ to His disciples, contained in it the essentials which went to lay the foundation of the Christian life. Whether the disciples perfectly understood their Master, or if they so far understood it, whether they might not think that the attractions of a temporal throne, with which their hearts were filled, should not be permitted to outweigh every other consideration, may be a question; but that the doctrine in all its naked simplicity and spirituality was given to them, and is through them handed down for the instruction of the Church for future ages, there can be no doubt.

Digitized by Google

It is obvious then, according to the teaching of our blessed Lord, that *there is a life which we have to lose, and that there is a life which we have to gain;* and that in losing the one, we gain the other. It is obvious also, that Christ Himself hath set us an example in His own career of this loss and gain, and hath given us instruction as to what the loss means, and as to what the gain means, with the injunction that we must be made like him, and walk in His steps, if we are to see Him as He is. It must be of vast importance, therefore, to enter upon the inquiry: What is it we are called on to give up, and what is it we may hope to acquire, in the disciplinary process we are asked to undergo? The illustration employed by our Lord will be of essential service in aiding this inquiry.

We are all more or less familiar with what takes place when the seed-corn is sown in the earth; and we also know that the same thing would not take place were the seed-corn left in bags and allowed to lie in the barn. When the grains of wheat or of corn are sown in the ground, the all but invisible germ, being affected by the moisture of the soil, pushes itself forth; and in so doing, it first of all absorbs the mealy portion of the grain, which is thus taken away; and nothing is left but the bare husk or shell of that which was formerly solid grain. The seed-corn has come in this way to be destroyed; but what do we find? We find that in its death or destruction, there is raised up or produced a new life, in that a vigorous plant is set a going, which in the long run issues in the reproduction of manifold returns of the original. Whereas (as we well know), had the seed remained in the sack, it would have continued unchanged, no sacrifice would have taken place, and no

Digitized by Google

multiplication of itself would have been manifested: "it abideth alone". It is interesting to note the fact which the seed cast into the ground displays, *viz.*, that by the sacrifice which the grain of corn or of wheat undergoes, there arises a new, a richer, and a more exuberant life.

The doctrine of sacrifice in the natural world is largely represented in every department. The whole realm of nature affords a remarkable exemplification of this great truth. Death is everywhere the preliminary condition on which new life is based. For example, plant-life is destroyed, that vegetation may subsist: vegetable life again must be destroyed, that animal life may be supported; for we know that when vegetable matter is swallowed by an animal, the digestive process carries it away in contributing to the nourishment of the animal frame. Among animals again, the life of those in a higher scale is sustained by the sacrifice of those in a lower scale. In the summer mornings I have again and again looked out of my window to observe the blackbirds hopping on the grass in search of worms, when these crawlers creep forth so far from their holes; and I have observed that sometimes when the bird had got hold of a worm which from its large size was somewhat unmanageable, it would repeatedly peck at, and bite the worm, and even shake it for minutes till it be dead; and it would then break it into bits, swallow each bit as it was broken off, till the whole was devoured. The bird lives thereby; and the worm is sacrificed for the sake of the bird. Up through all the grades of animal life, we find a manifold exemplification of the self-same law, —*viz.*, this, that *the higher nature lives by the sacrifice of the lower.* I need not point out to you the ravages

Digitized by Google

made by beasts of prey, nor set before you the great facts which prevail in the sea as illustrations of the subsistence of one life by the sacrifice of another life. You are moreover aware of the great demolition of animal life, that takes place for the sake of man, and for his maintenance upon the earth. You will thus readily understand from what has now been said, that the great law of sacrifice is found abundantly instituted and prevalent in the Kingdom of nature.

But does it extend to the moral world as well? The animals have no moral law; and hence without compunction, they may devour one another, for they have no knowledge of right and of wrong. That is true: yet they do but follow an instinct imparted to them by the Creator Himself, the Source and the Guardian of morals. And as I have just referred to men, as practising this law, let me observe that it holds good not less in civilised than in savage life; the difference being, that in savage life, man himself is not infrequently made the victim of man, to remove some supposed evil, or to promote some supposed good, in respect of the offerer,—a kind of sacrifice from which we, who know better, recoil as witless, and cruel, and profitless.

But there is a real case of sacrifice which man is required to perform upon himself, in order to his own higher and greater good, a case to which man is naturally averse, because it not only causes him pain, but runs counter to his strongest predilections. We find him personally connected with a higher nature. The lower nature has its foundation in the body of the flesh, and gives rise to what are called our dispositions, tastes, and tendencies; and looks only to the gratifications which pertain to this earthly existence. The higher nature

Digitized by Google

again is connected with God Himself, and is called the spiritual nature, as drawing its principles from God, and as looking to a future world where those principles shall alone be prevalent. We are all of us born with the lower nature: we bring it into the world with us, when we appear therein, as descended from our parents by ordinary generation; but as rational beings, we who belong to the higher race, who are gifted with the prerogative of moral discernment, are capable of receiving the higher nature. And God offers this higher nature to us, by the revelation of Himself to us in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Now what are we taught hereby? We are taught that if the higher nature is to become ours, if it is to live in us, if it is to have the free and full expansion of its proper and peculiar vitality, the lower nature must be sacrificed, that is, the lower nature must be so taken out of the way, as to admit of what is called spiritual freedom.

But how is this to be done? Every creature clings to its natural life as the strongest craving of its constitution. God had in various ways signified His will to man; but with no effective result; and these words came forth from His mouth:—"My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh"; that is, carnally minded in the highest degree. Carried away by the desires of his own animal nature, supported as it was by all that is in the world, man would not listen to any counter proposals, whereby that nature should be restrained. God preached to them in the days of Noah, but they were irreclaimable; and there was no alternative but to sweep them off the face of the earth. God thereafter chose Abraham, and his posterity, and we know what an elaborate ritual he estab-

Digitized by Google

lished among that people, that he might attract them by sensible signs, and teach them spiritual things by means of worldly things. The sacrificial economy instituted by the instrumentality of Moses, had really for its object the application of the law of sacrifice to the lower nature of man, in order that the heart of man might be thereby opened to the spiritual injunctions of God. It was for this end, that a series of victims were selected, to which the condition of the offerer might by touch be imparted,—a condition that signified the impartation of the sin of the offerer to the creature; and then, man seeing his sin as hereby embodied in the creature, to teach the lesson that sin should receive its due desert and be slain. The lesson practically read to man by this ritual was, that man should put away from himself the evil of his doings, and so undergoing purification before God might become dead to his sin.

But the blind and stiff-necked Jews came to regard the bare abstract slaughter of the victims as in themselves all the sacrifice which God required; and hence they came to regard themselves as quits with God, merely because they went through the dry details of a commanded ritual. This was not at all fulfilling the ideal of the Jewish ritual. It was intended to teach an abhorrence of sin. That intention was obvious; but so blinded were the Jews that it had to be particularly expounded by John the Baptist, as truly an economy of Repentance, *i.e.*, for the sacrifice of sin; and he represented more fully the spiritual enactments of the law, than any prophet who had preceded him.

But this was not enough: it behoved that a true victim should be obtained, who should *in his own person* literally fulfil what the law in point of fact demanded.

Digitized by Google

Hence the appearance of Jesus Christ, as the literal and real fulfilment of the profound principles of the Divine law, and as therefore the closing up of the law, in the absolute satisfaction he rendered to all its demands. In Jesus Christ then we are made to look for the manifestation of the law of sacrifice in its perfection. On this theme I have already dwelt at sufficent length in these pages.

I recur to the illustration supplied by the text. In the corn of wheat, planted in the ground, we see the death or destruction of a constituted body; and the reproduction, through that sacrifice, of a new and more exalted life. Now, it is allowed on all hands that Jesus Christ is "the corn of wheat" referred to: how, then, is the death of Christ to be explained, and how is the life which springs up, on the basis of this death, to be explained? Commentators, it must be confessed, are not particularly happy in satisfying the requirements of the problem. As regards the death of Christ, reference is made by them to the death only upon the tree, as if that death constituted the sum total of all that is involved in the term "death". It is not to be forgotten, of course, that the death upon the tree, being the consummation of that great sacrifice which Christ rendered here below, and being the last shred of sacrifice in the entire offering-up of the flesh, as being, moreover, literally, what we call "death," in that it is the entire stoppage and absolute destruction of what is called bodily life—when the body must be removed, put out of sight, and laid in the tomb to moulder and decay—it is not to be forgotten that it is most natural to refer to this death upon the tree as implying all that is involved in the term "death," as applicable to Christ.

Digitized by Google

But we cannot be too careful in discriminating, first, that Christ had through life suffered the death of all bodily desires that could disturb His spirituality; and, second, that so far as the death upon Calvary involved the pains and penalties inflicted by wicked men, as He hung upon the tree, these are to be regarded as so much expenditure, in constituting the sacrifice of Christ; but the sacrifice that pleased God was the putting away of that which came between him and free, full communion with God. The sacrifice of Christ, as a whole, consisted in the consignment of the demands of the body gradually to death, and ultimately the outer body itself to absolute death—death as the entire arrestment of its life, so that the body of the flesh had not only no impulses any longer, but had no longer any being at all in the world, and, therefore, of course, no longer any influence whatever to assault the soul, or to be the medium of assaults from the devil or from the world.

And the admiration claimed for Christ at the last hour, is, not merely that He consented to die, but consented to have life taken away under penalties so unmerciful and so unmerited. Hence we are to bear in mind, that, while everything else that pertained to the body of the flesh, had been yielded up, in the course of His priestly ministration on earth, before the last great crisis arrived, the dissolution of life upon the tree was but the *finishing part of the great piacular process* which He underwent; and the sufferings which He endured on the tree were but the tortures inflicted by man, acting under the agency of Satan—sufferings which, though very properly regarded as the price which He was made to pay, were in themselves no source of gratification or occasion of satisfaction unto God. No! The satisfaction unto God

Digitized by Google

lay in the removal of that nature, as a power in the soul, in which sin had its seat and source; and through which Satan operated, and through which also the influences of the world could reach, and did reach, him. Here, then, was the dissolution of the carnal part: it was absolutely taken away as a prompter of the soul; and herein it follows that the very thing was taken away which came between God and the soul: a sacrifice, therefore, had been made, which left the divine impulses absolutely free in the regulative action of the soul, as a creature in harmony with God.

So far with respect to the *sacrifice;* now, as to the beauteous plant which sprung up in the basis of that sacrifice. Commentators do not sufficiently rest their attention on this very important consideration; nor do they, as a rule, follow it out to its legitimate conclusion. Let it be noted that it is the growth of the new plant, that alone can bear fruit. A dead and destroyed plant cannot bear fruit, a fresh and vigorous plant alone can fulfil the realization of fruit. What then? Is it Jesus, as having died, that is the tree of life? "Yea, rather it is Jesus that has risen again from the dead." What constituted the risen Jesus? It is answered, the fact that Jesus was "sanctified": the fact that Jesus was delivered from the body of sin: the fact that Jesus had "died to sin". That alone now lived as pertaining to Jesus, which could not die. He is raised, therefore, from the tomb with the flesh and the blood of immortality: He is "the first fruits" of them that sleep. Death having been applied in taking out of the way all that could infect the soul, there is now constituted a new manhood, wholly and absolutely under the sway of the Divine Spirit—a manhood fulfilling all the contem-

Digitized by Google

plation of God—a manhood in perfect harmony with the divine law—a manhood adapted for glorification with God. Hence the establishment of a tree of life, "the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations": hence the constitution of "the true vine," that shall yield the sap of life to the branches that are grafted therein.

We have to note, then, what it is that constitutes the immediate source of our redemption and salvation. It is not the death of Christ as regarded by itself. Had Christ not risen and ascended and sanctified His Church, our "faith would have been vain, we had been still in our sins". The growth of a new plant was absolutely essential to the production of fresh life; and it is from this risen plant that we obtain the flow of that stream of life, whereby alone we can be received to true life. The Scriptures are very express as to this. First of all, they make it clear that "it behoved Christ to suffer in order to enter into His glory"; *i.e.*, it behoved Christ to become a sacrifice for sin, a sin-offering in fact, that out of this, there might be the sprinkling of the true blood. This sacrificial process is called "the perfecting of Christ"; and unless we understand what is called the perfecting of Christ, we shall fail to understand in what consists the glorification of Christ; and unless we know what constitutes the glorification of Christ, we shall fail to apprehend the grounds and the process of our salvation. Christ could not have become our Redeemer until He had first of all personally achieved the redemption of that body of ours, which He assumed. In that redemption we have the foundation laid of our redemption.

The sad and crying evil is, that we refuse to look at

Digitized by Google

that redemption. Though the Scriptures are very express on this point, yet are we found to turn away from the teaching of holy Scripture, lest forsooth! we should do dishonour to Christ. We will persist in mistaking the precise character of the work which Christ had to do, by insisting on the dogma of Substitution, which has no foundation whatever in Scripture. We are so wedded to the notion, lest otherwise Christ should come to be regarded as a sinner. I hold most emphatically all that can be proclaimed as to the sinlessness of Jesus Christ, and yet that He was "made sin"—made sin for us; and that He "put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself". That verse in the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not understood as it ought to be, which tells us that He "when He had *by Himself* purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high". As a simple fact, *our sins, that lie on us personally, are not purged away;* and in testimony of this, we are every day praying that they may be purged more and more, and that we may be cleansed more and more from all unrighteousness. Mankind are now born with the burden of the carnal nature upon them, and they are purged *now only* by the sprinkling of the precious blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin. But in the text referred to, what is the language in reality set before us?—"having *made for Himself* a purgation of sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high". The personal work of the Lord Jesus is not only here spoken of, but it is a personal work declared first and fundamentally to have personal reference to Himself, in order that He might be installed as the Saviour of men. The grounds are given, out of which His position is secured, as the

Digitized by Google

glorified One at God's right hand. He took what is ours by taking our flesh and blood, and He purged what is ours.

And this is not the only passage in this important epistle which otherwise, but with unmistakable emphasis, declares the same great truth. In the 9th chapter of this Epistle we are told that "Christ having come as a High Priest of the good things that are to be, did enter once for all into the Holy Place by means of a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—not of this creation (*i.e.*, by a body not of our present gross material structure of flesh and blood), nor by means of the blood of goats and of calves, but by means of *His own* blood, He *having obtained for Himself eternal redemption*". Such is the translation which alone I am able to give to the passage; and it alone brings out the true nature of that Sacrifice which Christ underwent, and it makes obvious what really constituted the ground of Christ's exaltation. Here was one who had laid hold of our tabernacle of flesh and blood, as we have it in the world, who therefore had a great sacrificial and expiatory work to perform before it was possible to put on the greater and more perfect tabernacle; but having been put to death in the flesh (in that carnal nature whereby we are led astray), and being perfected by the free and full play of the Spirit over the whole man, there was hereby a redeemed manhood constituted; there was now no barrier, why the spotless One should not present Himself unto God, as having a claim to sit at God's right hand; and taking His place there, should now sprinkle "*His own* blood" upon us, to purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. It was only then, that Christ could exer-

Digitized by Google

cise the office of Saviourship, as King and Head of His church on earth.

What more positive declaration can we have, confirmatory of this statement, than the saying of the same inspired author: "having been made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him"? Christ is the source and fountain of life; but not because of His death simply; for *His* death as such can never give forth our life, but because through His death in the flesh, there has sprung up in Him that new life, which through the Eternal Spirit, He has first infused into His own humanity, and having then "laid the foundation" in His own person, there is no reason why the self-same regenerative power, by its *application* to us, should not in the circumstances operate in the generations of men.

Are we enabled now to see the process by which the sacrifice of Christ is applied to us? The conditions in which alone that process could be achieved was simply this, first of all, that personally "He who was made a little lower than the angels, should, by means of His suffering of death, be crowned with glory and honour". In this way would *the ultimate object* for which He came into the world and died, be accomplished; and so it could be said that "He tasted death for every man"; for it was His purpose that being Himself perfected, "the grace of God, bringing salvation, should appear unto all men". Not that it is meant for a moment that *all* men must hereby be saved; for as God can force salvation upon none, so there is of necessity an election of such to everlasting life (that is to receive the grace of life), as have beforehand (under the general scheme for bringing sinners to repentance)

Digitized by Google

come to be assisted in the pursuit of a carnal and worldly life.

The points then of that process through which our salvation is obtained, may briefly be stated thus. *First* and fundamentally that the death of the body of Christ was absolutely essential, as a preliminary to the appearance of the resurrection-body, in order to establish a framework without sin: *Second*, that the resurrection-body, being animated by, and in perfect harmony with, a soul in entire unison with God; and being no longer of the nature which is adapted to this gross material sphere, was raised from the earth to the more spiritual dwelling-place of God Himself: *Third*, that of necessity it was glorified there, with the glory of that heavenly sphere; and that being glorified, as a mark of the victory which Christ had obtained over Satan, the prince of the world, there came the presentation of the world to Christ, as the fulfilment of the covenant-agreement betwixt the Father and the Son, and therefore as the purchased possession of Christ as the Son of Man. *Fourth*, that in virtue of this new relation in which Christ now actually stood to the world, a relation in which He became "the Prince of life" to mankind, it behoved Him to reveal Himself to the world, and to apply Himself as revealed, to the world, for the express purpose of undoing in men the work of the devil on the one hand, and so of rescuing man from his grasp; and of penetrating the souls of men on the other hand, with His own righteousness. This was the great achievement which Christ was now in His exaltation qualified to fulfil,—an achievement involving the application of His own case to our humanity; and of course involving a change that had to

Digitized by Google

be wrought, in the souls of men, in order to their redemption from sin, and their establishment in holiness.

How was this change in man to be brought about? There are two sides of what is one and the self-same process, a dying in order to a quickening, an yielding up of something in order to an acquisition of something, a relinquishment of what is offensive to the Divine mind, in order to the obtainment of what is well pleasing to God. Hence in man there must be generated the exercise of two saving graces, *viz.*, "Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ". The exercise of these two saving graces brings us to the position wherein we are now placed in the world—a position in which we have to "work out our salvation"—a position in which, through the revealments of Christ, we are animated and enabled to do so—a position in which, through the discipline established under the Gospel, we have power and encouragement given to us to sacrifice what is evil, and to lay hold of what is good; it being found that repentance achieves the one and faith secures the other. Thus do we become the corn of wheat that is cast into the ground: we die that we may live: we die unto sin (and this means, if it means anything, the extinction of sin in our hearts), that we may be raised up as plants of grace, plants prepared for glory, and so be "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ".[1]

[1] Since the foregoing pages were in type, I have read Mr. Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, a book in many respects valuable, as serving to establish what in these pages I have sought to enounce by a different process of thought. Hence I cannot help taking notice of a difficulty which comes in his way, which should be no real difficulty, when duly considered. Under the chapter, "Con-

Digitized by Google

Thus it is set forth that there is no other law of life for the servants and followers of the Lord Jesus than the law which was applied to, and took place in, the the person of Christ Himself—that there is, therefore, no other mode of redemption from sin than the self-abnegation which constitutes the self-hating, self-renouncing, self-surrendering of the carnal man to death —that what has held good of Christ Himself in the accomplishment of a sacrifice acceptable to God, a

formity to Type," wherein he properly shews that all life comes from a previous germ of life, and in each case in accordance with its Type, he says :—

"But the great question still remains: How is the christian to be conformed to the Type, or as we should now say, dealing with consciousness, to the Ideal? The mere knowledge of the Ideal is no more than a motive. How is the process to be practically accomplished? Who is to do it? When? Where? How? This is the test question of christianity. It is here that all theories of christianity, all attempts to explain it on natural principles, all reductions of it to philosophy, inevitably break down. It is here that all imitations of christianity perish. It is here, also, that personal religion finds its most fatal obstacle. Men are all quite clear about the Ideal. We are all convinced of the duty of mankind regarding it. But how to secure that willing men shall attain it, that is the problem of religion. It is the failure to understand the dynamics of christianity, that has most seriously and most pitifully hindered its growth, both in the individual and in the race."

How does Mr. Drummond get over the difficulty? He says, "from the standpoint of biology this practical difficulty vanishes in a moment": he says, "Christ makes the christian". Most true! And now I ask Mr. Drummond: By what process does Christ make the christian? He refers to the automatic processes of the natural body over which man has no control: he intimates that man is "the veriest automaton, every organ of his body given to him, every function arranged for him, brain and nerve, thought and sensation, will and conscience, all provided for him ready made". Then Mr. Drummond exclaims: "O preposterous and vain man, thou who couldst not make

Digitized by Google

sacrifice which He alone could offer, is not the less on that account the type or representation of the very sacrifice which we have to offer, and which He only has enabled us to offer. Now, Christ's sacrifice is properly said to be fulfilled in us, when we are in true fellowship with Him, that is, when, through the communication of His word and Spirit we, like Him, are enabled to die unto sin and to live unto righteousness; and so we are privileged with Him to reach to, and attain, similar blessedness and glory.

a finger nail of thy body, thinkest thou to fashion this wonderful, mysterious, subtle soul of thine after the Ineffable Image? Wilt thou ever permit thyself to be conformed to the image of the Son? Wilt thou, who canst not add a cubit to thy stature, submit to be raised by the Type-life within thee to the perfect stature of Christ?"

We enter a strong protest against this representation of the process of man's regeneration. Man is not an automaton as hereby set forth in respect of this most important question. If he were, where would be his responsibility? If man were a blind, automatic, involuntary creature in the construction of his spiritual being, even as he is an unwitting and helpless agent in the construction of his material being, he could have no more accountability for the condition of his spiritual being than he has or can have for the condition of his material being, as a man brought into the world by the ordinary law of generation. And Mr. Drummond sees very soon that his process of soul-construction as a spiritual being, cannot be carried fairly out. For he asks: "Is man then out of the arena altogether? Is he mere clay in the hands of the potter, a machine, a tool, an automaton? Yes, and no. If he were a tool he would not be man. If he were a man he would have something to do. One need not seek to balance, what God does here, and what man does."

And is the great question of human regeneration left in this indefinite and uncertain balance between Divine and human interposition? I deprecate such a complexion of the subject, as utterly at variance with the law of Divine action, and I hold that the principles of law as supplied by God, are put in operation by man for the trans-

Digitized by Google

Literally, then, it comes to pass that we are saved, not by the mere abstract fact that Jesus died, and thereby endured the cross: such a view is the delusion which is but too widely entertained, and it is a delusion we cannot be too solicitous to have eradicated, for such a delusion points to an effect for which there is no adequate cause; and, certainly (when Scripture is fairly examined), for which there is no sufficient authority.

formation of the soul, when God supplies the mainspring of action, just as other principles of action are employed in the natural world. First of all, let it be understood that the new life is set before us, independent of us, and provided for us, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ; and the process of that new life is also set before us—a process of dying in order to living. The whole question, then, lies in this: Can we appropriate that process in having the materials and motives set before us to this end? We have the knowledge of the Ideal. But (says the Author) "the mere knowledge of the Ideal is no more than a motive". And what more can he want than a motive? Is it not motive which lies at the foundation of will? Did man ever do aught without a motive? Was ever anything accomplished without a motive? And if every formation of will without exception arises from motive; what more is wanting, if God supplies an all-sufficient motive? We find in the natural world that we can transpose one kind of life upon a stem which is not natural to it, not by working out any process in the stem, but by the engraftment of a life already formed for us, into the stem. The transformation of man, therefore, from the condition of the psychical to that of the spiritual, is simply the laying hold of the life thus formed for us, and engrafting it upon the soul. No man could do this of himself, no man could have the will or disposition to do so if left to himself, because he is naturally without the means and without the motive; but when he sees the infinite profit to his soul, and the means of applying the material of life vouchsafed to him, as by engraftment, to his soul; then is he enabled to fulfil all God's will in this respect; and his responsibility lies in adopting the grace of salvation through the exercise of self-renouncement; the motive for self-renouncement being abundantly revealed.

Digitized by Google

True it is, that the death of Christ is rightly spoken of as the life of His people; but this only as being the essential and indispensable preliminary, in virtue of which Christ came to live in glory, and so to be able to give life to His people. The doctrine of life eternal lies in this statement: "because I live, ye shall live also". We have seen through what circumstances it is that Christ lived after death, and rose again from the dead; the self-same circumstances give life also to us, who are brought into the self-same category with Jesus Christ. The circumstances may be briefly described as follows:—

Christ having achieved a victory over Satan, over death, over the grave, and having ascended to the right hand of the Father and obtained glorification there, looked down upon the little Church which He had gathered into *one* before His departure from the earth; and He gave out from Himself a history of His own contendings while in the world; and therewith a scheme of principles forming the divine laws for human regeneration—laws that were needed for the illumination, the purification, and perfection of the Church—laws which carried to all who received them the gift of the Holy Spirit. These laws were essential, that the Church might be inspired with a sense of the danger in which the natural man was involved, who remained in a carnal condition; and with a sense, at the same time, of the inestimable value of embracing the holy principles of God, as operative in Jesus Christ. The Church which had attached itself to Jesus Christ—believing in Him, and waiting on Him, for new life and light, was simply in the position of a branch grafted on the stem of a great tree, whose roots lay in the bosom of God, the

Digitized by Google

members thereof waited till the sap, which pertained to that tree, should effectually communicate itself to the branches. The Church was peculiarly the object of Christ's care, because it was a body conjoined by engraftment with Christ Himself, waiting to receive what Christ had to impart, that it might become one with Him, and so become conformed to Him. Without Him the Church could do nothing. "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine," so the Church, without the communications of Christ, must be utterly helpless to bring about the regeneration of its members. Christ, therefore, bestowed on this body, thus associated with Himself, the privilege which had been conferred on Himself. It was made the depository of the Divine nature, not indeed in the fulness which Christ possessed, because it behoved Him to be specially equipped; *first*, as being specially tried; *second*, as coming forward the Representative of man, to discharge a function which man, having lost that equipment, could not achieve; *third*, as being under a compact or covenant with the Father, to impart such amount of divine grace as is needful to regenerate and restore its members. In this way, then, it fell to the Church, as an embodiment, united to the risen body of our Lord, and, therefore, undergoing the process which the body of our Lord underwent, in order to its perfection, that it likewise might be a joint-partaker with Him in glory.

Thus, then, was the promise fulfilled which Christ made to His Church, ere He took His personal farewell. "I will not leave you desolate (He said), I will come unto you." And He did come in all the essentials of His being, that they, being engrafted into Him, might

Digitized by Google

have the communications of His grace conveyed to them. Hereby was established that heavenly stream of the water of life, which had in it the virtue of everlasting life; or shall we say that outflow of the blood of life which formed the life-blood of His own being—an outflow which one may characterize as that proffer of Divine food which constitutes the body of Christ, and which is supplied for the purposes of new life to the Church. No matter by what name this effusion may be called, whether the water of life, or the body and blood of Christ, or the bread of life, it is the communication of Christ to our souls, in virtue of which we live spiritually, and are brought into oneness with Christ, and have the prerogative of salvation as ours.

Mark, then, the necessity that is laid on us, of dying unto sin, and of living unto righteousness in order to our glorification.[1] It is said in Scripture, that we must be brought into conformity to Christ. It is said, that "we must die with Him that we may live with Him," that is, according to every rational interpretation, we *must die as Christ died, that we may live as Christ liveth.* Paul, in his own person, fulfilled this saying: Paul could say, "I bear in my body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Christ may be made manifest in my mortal body". What was this "dying," on the part of Paul, but "the following of Christ," in the deeper meaning of that term; and what, but a necessary preliminary, in order to the spiritual life which pervaded his soul. And what was there in Paul's case, but what belongs to every one of us. "I beseech you, brethren (says he to the Galatians), *be as I am;*

[1] See the subject of sacrifice further detailed in Chapter VII.

Digitized by Google

for I am as ye are." Put on with me the sacrifice of Christ, for it is equally needful for you as for me.

See to it, then, that if you are to be prepared for heaven, there must first be the experience of what is properly termed *death.* Death is the precursor of life in the moral world, as truly as in the physical; for death in the moral world simply implies the removal of those obstacles which stand in the way of true and pure spiritual life. We see this exemplification of death, as the precursor of a more glorious life—in the physical instance of the butterfly. We all know the history of the butterfly's development. The eggs of the butterfly are first all manifested as worms, frequently seen on the cabbage leaves. These worms are slow, indolent creatures, feeding on the green herbage during the summer months, and as winter comes on, the creature becomes torpid, forms into a shell, practically dies, having, however, the germ of a new life within. What happens, then, as the following summer returns? The shell bursts its frame, and there comes forth a painted butterfly, beautiful in colour and active in movement, a new creature in fact, as compared with the forbidding-looking creature it formerly was.

We have, then, most wondrous analogies in nature, confirmatory of the great assurances of Scripture. It was indispensable that He, Who came down from heaven to inaugurate the law of human recovery, should pioneer the way to human regeneration, by the sole and only process whereby it can be accomplished, *viz.*, "through death". Paul lays that way down, *viz.*, "conformity to His death," as an absolute and indispensable law—a law which, while it made the death of Jesus an inexorable necessity, stands indispensable for us, as that to

Digitized by Google

which we must be prepared, and from which there is no exemption on our part, if we are to live and reign with Him.

Is it not a necessity? Are we exempted from the law of sacrifice because Jesus died? Why, then, should the *Scriptures* make it a necessity for us, as well as for Him? Why should Jesus, in selecting His apostles, as the foundation of His Church, address them, saying: "he that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it"? Why does He enjoin the sacrifice of the cross upon us, so urgently demanded; for He says, "he that doth not take his cross and follow after Me, is not worthy of Me"? Why does Paul insist that "our old man should be crucified with him"? We are not exempted from dying as Jesus died; and much less are we exempted because Jesus died. There is no principle in Scripture or in reason that can support such a view as this. The view is the sadly mistaken one which says that Jesus, having on Calvary paid our debts, in circumstances in which we had no debts to pay, as not being in existence, it has led churches into the most grievous and distressing blunders, from the way in which this dogma is applied.

It is most true that, were it not for the money of the Lord Jesus expended on us, we could not one of us discharge the load of sin, nor present the coin of true righteousness; but we have the Lord's money conveyed to us *now;* and who sees not that the discharge must be made by means of that money conveyed in and through ourselves? It is, therefore, but a miserable pretext—a pretext pregnant with mischief of no ordinary sort, to propound, that sacrifice is not needed on our part, because the sacrifice of Jesus has been required,

Digitized by Google

and has been sustained, as all-sufficient. By that sacrifice we have admitted, and do admit, and we do proclaim, that an all-sufficient atonement has been made; but yet what we say is, that it has been primarily made simply as the *foundation* of salvation; for that foundation must be *applied* to us; and being laid in us, we must build thereon. There is no such thing as the dogma of substitution in the Word of God. It repudiates that dogma when it says that "the father shall not be put to death for the son, nor shall the son be put to death for the father; but *every man shall be put to death for his own sin*". It repudiates substitution when it says "every man shall *bear his own burden*". True it is, that Christ is said to have taken our burden and we are said to partake of his righteousness; but in neither case is it the imputation of *a make-believe.* When Christ came, He came clothed in the garments of our flesh and blood; and he who denies this is said to be an antichrist; and when we are said to partake of His righteousness, it is in like manner a sober practical reality, otherwise we upset the doctrine of justification by faith, and say there is no need for us to take on the yoke of Christ.

But while it stands in Scripture, as well in reason, that we must become "dead with Christ," it is not for a moment to be supposed that we must needs suffer a violent death such as Christ underwent on Calvary; that is too extravagant an idea to be meant or entertained for a moment. The death of the body in its most absolute form was incumbent on Christ, as clothed with our mortal body; and without doubt He endured that death upon the tree; but the circumstantials, wherewith that death was surrounded, formed no neces-

Digitized by Google

sary part of the atonement which Christ rendered to God. The circumstantials were but the work of men instigated by the wicked one. These circumstantials did not help in the least degree to put away sin. They had their origin in the malignity of bloodthirsty men; and the bearing of them by Christ, only showed that Christ would not shrink from this last act of dying, as the final necessity laid upon Him, seeing it was in the power of Satan that it should be attended with such pangs and sufferings.

It has formed a subject of wonder unto many who hold by the doctrine of substitution, why, if Christ by His death destroyed death (as assuredly He did), it does not happen that His followers, one and all, without exception, are not exempted from death; and they have invented the plea that Christ did not take away "the temporal consequences of sin, but only the eternal consequences of sin". Such a plea has no ground whatever to rest upon. We should remember that, as sin has its foundation in the human body, the human body must die; and that, too, in its absolute sense. It must be removed as fundamentally the source of sin to the soul; and hence to the sinner and saint alike, to the christian and to the heathen alike, the sentence of temporal death must hold good; the difference in the true christian being, that under the discipline of the Gospel, the soul has become purified from the dominion of the carnal element, ere the carnal part itself has come to be removed and carried away.

And this purification from the dominion of the carnal in the soul, constitutes, first of all, the death to which we are called. We cannot, of course, so long as we are in the body, prevent the due and ordinary requirements

Digitized by Google

of the body from having their cravings listened to and respected, for, otherwise, we should foolishly err on the other side; and many do err and have erred, by applying pains and stripes and scourgings to the flesh, which have no bearing on the great question of carnal ascendency in the soul, and utterly fail to meet the question of sin. The question which points to the sole supremacy of the Spirit of God upon the soul, and the consequent purification of the soul from all intermediate officiation, is alone the question of interest. What is required, is that "the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ" should so powerfully operate in our souls, as that "the law of sin, which is in our members," should have no power to lead the soul into a willing fulfilment of its desires. This is the death to which we must needs be subjected, to which every follower of the Lord Jesus Christ must be subjected—a death which, in the first place, consists in the entire restriction of the untoward desires of the flesh, and, in the second place, in the absolute resignation of the body of the flesh to destruction, and, consequently, to the entire stoppage of its functions, as a dominating ingredient of human thought. This last experience, which we ordinarily call by the name of death, is to the christian but the final part of the sacrifice, which he has to undergo, when his soul shall be for ever relieved from the calls and the claims which it makes upon us in this world, and when it will henceforth be animated by a new body of spirit-flesh and blood, built up by the communication of those precious acquisitions which have been received from Christ, as the portion of Christ to us; while to the mere worldling, whose carnal manhood has been undisturbed, the dissolution of the body leaves the soul uncleansed,

Digitized by Google

unsanctified, unsacrificed, in respect of the dominion and prevalence of principles which cannot consist with heaven, and cannot consist with communion with God.

What is to become of such a soul—a soul which has thus preserved and retained the carnal life—a soul which has failed to receive and realize the spiritual life? Our Lord answers when he says, "he that saveth his life shall *lose* it". Such a soul being filled with the things only which emanate from the flesh and from the world, cannot have life in an atmosphere which is meant to support and to sustain spiritual life alone. The world that now is, as a world of material things, goes to sustain the soul, so long as it is in the body; but when the body dies, the region of spiritual life has nothing in it to unify and nourish the carnal mind, and nothing in it to give play to the carnal thoughts of a carnalized soul: accordingly, it must be *lost* in a region where spiritual impulses alone have their sway.

No wonder, then, that we find the Apostle Paul, entering into the deep meaning which is implied by "the dying of the Lord Jesus," and that he is found praying that he "might know Him, and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, by becoming conformed to His death". There are those who are emphatically "the children of the resurrection"—those who, having partaken of the life of Christ, cannot be absolutely confined by the power of death, but who, so soon as the sunshine of heaven that shall break forth to inaugurate the morning of the resurrection, *i.e.*, so soon as it shall spread its powerful ray upon souls, souls shall be restored by a bright revival of all that they have partaken of from Him, and in proportion as they have partaken of Him;

Digitized by Google

while the old and carnal things shall go to the corruption that is inherent in them. In order to the susceptibility of this resurrection-power, there must be preliminarily "a fellowship with the sufferings of Christ"; and this fellowship consists in the denial of one's self to the dominion of carnal lusts and pleasures, as known to constitute the great evil of man. It is therefore to these things that we are to die; and in dying to these, we are said to suffer with Christ. No one can deny himself to the things which give him carnal enjoyment, without having "fellowship in the sufferings of Christ". Yet into these are we baptized, when we are early consecrated to God in Christ's name; as the Apostle says, "we are baptized into His death," that is, by our very dedication to be one with Christ, it is implied that we must go through the ordeal of Christ—an ordeal which infers death in order to life. Paul is very emphatic and imperative upon this point. "We must suffer with Him (he says) that we may be glorified together with Him"; and "if we be *dead with Him* (he continues) we shall also live with Him". What can be clearer or more unambiguous than the saying, "if we be planted in the likeness of His death" (or as our more recent translators give it, *if we are united with the likeness of His death*), "we shall be also [united] by the likeness of His resurrection". He explains all this as saying that "the old man in us must be crucified with Him," that is, that "the body of sin" which is born with us, and which cleaves to the soul as the dominating agent of the soul, must be so restrained, and centred, and controlled, as to be really sacrificed; and as sacrificed, to be done away as a power in the soul. This being effected, we are said to be no longer "in bondage to the law," *i.e.*, we

Digitized by Google

are no longer in bondage to the law of the flesh, as *the power of sin*, and we are, therefore, no longer under the law of terrors, as the *punisher of sin;* for the law of terrors can only bear upon the law of sin, its principle being that "the wages of sin is death".

This explains to us why Jesus died, and it explains to us why we must die. Jesus was "made under the law when He was made flesh," and, therefore, Jesus came under the law which proclaimed death to the flesh, as fundamentally the law of sin. Jesus, apart from this, could never have been subjected to the law of death; but being made liable to all the assaults which came from the body of the flesh, as the body of sin, it behoved Him to die in order to the recovery of the humanity; and the case of Christ is precisely expressed when it is said of the death He underwent, that "*He died unto sin once,*" that is, once for all, absolutely, effectually, and for ever (so that sin shall no more assail Him), "but the life that He liveth, He liveth unto God"; that is, the manhood is exclusively under the power and guidance of the Divine Spirit. This very sacrifice on the part of Christ is precisely what is demanded of us; for the Apostle proceeds on the back of this to say: "Likewise ye *(even so ye)*, reckon ye yourselves also to be *dead unto sin* but *alive unto God* in Jesus Christ". And this death unto sin he explains by saying: "let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof". The analogy betwixt our case and that of Christ is close; and confirms what John says, that "as Christ is, so are we in like manner in the world". "As Christ is!" Christ is now in glory—in glory after the death He died—in exaltation after the humiliation which He endured—in

Digitized by Google

blessedness after the sorrows He sustained. So are we in like manner in the world, under the discipline of the Divine Spirit,—under the training which the Gospel enjoins, thereby becoming freed from the bondage of sin; and we shall thus have our end along with Him, as partakers of His righteousness, and so enter into the enjoyment of everlasting life.

And Peter is no less emphatic in declaring the self-same law. Recognising with the Apostle Paul, that the foundations of human sin are in the flesh, as when Paul says, that "in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing," and that "they who are in the flesh cannot please God," in as far as "the carnal mind is enmity against God," and further, that Christ was "made sin" when He was "made flesh," Peter says, "forasmuch as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm ye yourselves also with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin, that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God". This, then, is the sacrifice imposed on us by the whole Word of God, even the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Himself—that sacrifice which means death unto sin, that there may be life unto righteousness. Had not the earthly body of the Lord Jesus Christ been sacrificed, the heavenly body of Christ had never been realized; and so in our case, unless "the sentence of death" into which we are baptized, be executed; and for which we are prepared by the application of Christ, how shall we be glorified with Him in the enjoyment of life eternal?

But we must close this discussion; and in closing, I would ask you to see in the death of Christ, not an escape from your dying, but rather the imperative and

Digitized by Google

absolute necessity of your "dying with Him". Instead of involving any exemption on your part from the sacrifice which Christ underwent, its value and its essence constitutes a rule, that this very law cannot be dispensed with, as regards His disciples. The doctrine of death which Christ applied to Himself He equally applies to us. "He that saveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal". To save the life of this world, is to *sow to the flesh:* to strive for the life of the world to come, is to *sow to the spirit.* What then? "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." One thing, then, is clear to us, that, in order to eternal life, there must be in us the self-sacrificing death practised by the Lord Jesus Christ.

But how shall we set about this, the most difficult work of the Gospel—a work from which the natural man recoils—a work which only the ingenuity and subtlety of the devil hath suggested as no longer a necessity, because that Christ hath died? How shall the Church instigate to the prosecution of this self-denying work if she hath been made to understand that all sacrifice on the part of man is henceforward abrogated and sunk out of sight, yes! in the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is it true that such exceptional views do largely prevail among the professed teachers of the Gospel? And is it true that the Church, of which we are privileged to be members, supports and encourages such antinomian views? We do not think so.

That the reformation in Germany was able to bring out sufficiently clear and consistent views on this great subject, does not appear:—that the Churches, as a rule,

Digitized by Google

have ever been able quite to distinguish Christ as "made sin," from Christ as being "without sin," does not appear: that the great central doctrine of justification has borrowed for itself a righteousness, different from that of sanctification, as if there were and could be two kinds of righteousness in the sight of God, is a misfortune for the Church; but that the great work of redemption effectuated by the Lord Jesus, must needs be *applied* to us in order to our redemption, is often and expressly affirmed by our Church. We may not proclaim the sacrifice of Christ, therefore, without preaching our conformity thereto. We may not introduce immunities from Gospel discipline, which God hath not permitted. Christ is not only the rock to which we must cling, but He is the leader Whom we must follow: Christ is not only the foundation on which we must build, but the pattern to which we must be conformed. Christ has not only inaugurated the work of redemption in His own person, and not only has finished and perfected that work to the satisfaction of God the Father; but as the glorified One, and glorified on account of that work, He hath vouchsafed that "grace which bringeth salvation" to us, who received the same, as the principles of a new and transformed life. This grace constitutes the application of Christ, and of His atonement to us: yes! when we receive the Spirit which He had, when we bear the yoke which He carried, when we pursue the course which He took, when we follow the path which He trode. In this we must deny ourselves as He did. We cannot otherwise be His disciples: we cannot be His disciples if we are enslaved to the desires of a carnal life. We must have the same mind in us which be-

Digitized by Google

longed also to Him. This is the test of discipleship, this is the criterion of our christianity. Say not this is unnecessary severity. We may not compromise the message which we have received from God unto you. Oh! it is nothing but a mockery of the faith to say; Give us all the glorious privileges of christianity, but give us none of its discipline—none of its trials—none of its tribulations. It is a burlesque upon christianity to say peace, peace, to the man who is living in sin, and devoted to his sin. It is caricaturing the religion of God to say that the wages of sin is *not* after all the death of the sinner, or that the gift of eternal life can be conferred on the man who has not sacrificed his sin, and become dead thereto.[1]

[1] See two admirable chapters on "Parasitism," which supply valuable illustration in support of the foregoing argumentation against substitution, in Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VII.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."—GALATIANS VI. 14.

How are these words introduced? What gives occasion to them in the chapter before us? He had just referred to the Judaizing members of the Galatian Church, glorying in the flesh of their converts, whom, lest they should suffer persecution for the cross, they had constrained to be circumcised. These members, believing that Moses and the prophets could never be set aside in all that they commanded, would engraft all the Jewish ordinances on christianity. They would not willingly lose the consciousness of their peculiar privileges as Jews; and this consciousness became a matter of boasting and vain glorying—as much as to say, "See how great privileges we have, and what distinctions we enjoy, compared with other peoples: see, in short, how superior as a nation we are to other men".

But Paul had come to set at nought these outward privileges, and to hold, now that christianity had come, that the ceremonial of the law was of no value. The law was of use before Christ came, because its intention was to prepare the way for Christ. "The law (he says) was

Digitized by Google

our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ"; but now that Christ has come, we are no longer under the law. The law has become inept in these circumstances, and, therefore, of no service to us. Hence he says, "I through the law [as finding its imbecility] am dead to the law, that I might live unto God"; seeing the utter worthlessness of the law, as furniture to christianity—as an appendage to, or a necessity for, christianity, I ignore the law and pay no respect to it. As I cannot be justified by the works of the law—the ceremonials of which are made void by the sacrifice of Christ, I am become dead to the law, through the body of Christ, as the only true fulfilment of its meaning. I am discharged from all its observances, in as far as that has come, which these observances only typified, and in significance proclaimed. Hence (says Paul) "if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing"; and the reason is that, in these circumstances, they would be grasping at the shadow, and repudiating the substance.

Such, indeed, is the gist of the whole Epistle to the Galatians; and, therefore, he distinctly tells that Church, how vain and foolish was the object of the schismatic party. And not only so; their fundamental principle was grounded in a most unworthy motive; for after all, their object, as a Judaizing sect, was not so much to enforce the conditions of the law, in as far as they themselves did not keep the law, but only in as far as it served, on the one hand, to save them from persecution by the Jews, and, on the other hand, to increase the honour and the number of their party.

The scheme of religion which this party advocated was repulsive to the mind and feeling of the Apostle. That outward thing which they supported was not the

Digitized by Google

christianity which Paul taught. You might as well apply a plaster to your garments in order to heal a sore upon your body: it was possible to rend the garments while the heart remained untouched. The only way of dealing with man in order to his regeneration was that adopted by Jesus Christ, and that way is called "the cross of Christ". Hence the exclamation of the Apostle, in the words of the text, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom [rather *by which*] the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world".

I now put forth one of the most important questions ever propounded, *viz.*, *What was*, and *what is the cross* in which St. Paul gloried? In what does it consist? Was it the material cross, the cross of wood to which the body of Christ was nailed? Or was it the agony which Christ endured while, for six long hours, He hung a living man upon the tree? The one thought stands in connection with the other. The wooden cross would be regarded as nothing, were there no crucifixion associated therewith; but the wooden or material cross has come to be regarded with sacred feelings, as reminding us of the death of our blessed Lord thereon. It is not unnatural for the human mind to be carried away by the contemplation of an outward object. It was, indeed, a tragic event, Christ's final completion of His career on Calvary; and we are very apt to be absorbed thereby, to the exclusion of other essential and vital truth.

What was the crucifixion on the tree? What, but the mechanical application of grievous pains to the body, by the wicked men who adjudged Him to death thereby. Many see much more than this, and they

Digitized by Google

refer to the cry: "My God, My God, why hast *Thou* forsaken Me," as attesting some withdrawal of God, the Father, from His beloved Son—a withdrawal, it is said, which gave Christ the most poignant pain, far beyond anything else. But what evidence have we herein that God, the Father, either did withdraw Himself, or that, in that hour of bitter suffering, He laid any unseen burden of woe on His beloved Son? Certainly this does not appear from the exclamation now referred to. Jesus wanted to die: Jesus wanted to escape useless torture; and as hour after hour elapsed, and yet death did not come, what more natural than this passionate appeal to the Father, as if saying: "Surely Satan ought now to be satisfied; let death come, O My Father, and let Me be relieved. Why am I left thus exposed to profitless torture?" There is no reason in the wide world known to us why the Father should, at this moment of extreme anguish, bring some hidden and unknown pangs to bear upon Him; for the Son had been throughout in every tittle perfectly obedient to all His holy requirement.

I come, therefore, again to the great fact of the crucifixion on the tree, and I ask: In what did it consist? I can give but one answer: It consisted in the mechanical application of pain to the Lord Jesus by the hands of wicked men—such pain as of necessity brought about His death by a tedious agony. This kind of death was not adjudged to Him by the Father, but by the rulers of the Jews, instigated as they were, no doubt, by the influence of Satan, for "this (said Christ to them) is *your* hour, and the power of darkness". The Father, indeed, was appealed to by our Lord, and in a very imploring manner, to save Him from that hour; but the Father would not interpose. It was not for the Father

Digitized by Google

to interfere in a contest which Christ had Himself hitherto carried on, and carried on successfully, with Satan. It was the province of the Father to give to Satan entire freedom to do his uttermost and his worst, and it was the part of Christ to meet Satan under all the resources and wiles of His bitter hostility; and we know how courageously Christ faced this last and greatest trial which was laid upon Him, when He submitted to the shame and woe of the cross of Calvary.

If, then, the estimate here formed of the last great crisis in the career of our blessed Lord is correct—if it consisted simply in the application of those tortures which nailing to the accursed tree involved—tortures which of necessity inferred the death of the body, I would ask, What was the cross in which the Apostle Paul glorified? Did Paul glory in a cross which implied merely the element of suffering? I do not for a moment conclude that, in respect of the courage which was needed to meet this final spurt and spleen on the part of Satan and his emissaries, there was not in Christ the grandest display of moral dignity which the world has ever beheld; but what I have specially to call your attention to, is the simple nature of that crucifixion, as adjudged to Him by men exercising the worldly powers that be. I repeat, it was the infliction simply of suffering—a suffering that compassed His death. Did Paul, then, glory in the mere fact of suffering on the part of our Lord; and would suffering be in itself any satisfaction to God? And could mere suffering as such go to the removal of sin? We may rest assured that such an idea was not in the Apostle's thoughts. Let me say, suffering, as such, cannot take away sin; the cross, therefore, in which Paul gloried,

Digitized by Google

was not a material cross—not a cross which consisted merely in suffering.

It is true that not a few do adopt this conclusion; but it is a conclusion which has been detrimental to the cause of a true theology in the Church of Christ. The Roman Church has especially laid hold of this view; and, in consistency therewith, multitudes of its votaries have bethought themselves in what way they could best apply pains and penances to the body of the flesh, in the thought that thereby they might be more acceptable to God. This was the idea of Luther when he went into the convent at Erfurt; and, however persevering in harassing the poor body, in giving it no rest by night or by day, in applying every scourge he could think of for the flesh, he did not meet thereby the springs of sin, nor did he thereby choke up the outlets of sin. And the multitudes among the devotees of Rome, who practised external self-sacrifices, only deluded themselves, as the Jews of old deluded themselves, that they were quits with God, when they had undergone these formal self-inflicted penalties.

But as regards the cross of Calvary, let it be noted that the thieves who were put to death side by side with Jesus, endured the self-same sufferings which He endured; aye! and even more, for they had their legs broken while they were yet alive—a calamity from which Jesus was spared, on the ground that death in His case had supervened before they resorted to that course. We conclude, then, that the crucifixion upon the tree endured by our dear Redeemer, was but the penalty which wicked men, who hated His teaching, imposed—imposed, no doubt, as influenced and instigated by Satan, who obviously, as a last resource, hoped to make Christ

Digitized by Google

resile from the judgment of the powers that be; and this on the plea of its being so awfully painful to the body; and, therefore, in order to His being freed from such bodily torment. Satan knew that Christ was most reluctant to bear this terror: he knew that the human nature recoiled from the pains of such a dismal death, more especially as mere suffering in itself did not go any length to the removal of sin; and it would have been a triumph for Satan, at the twelfth hour, if Christ had escaped from this death upon the plea of its painfulness, and so have after all resisted this judgment of the authorities, because of claims on the part of the body of the flesh.

But it may be asked: Is there not pain in crucifixion, and are not the sufferings of Christ continually referred to in connection with the atonement which He rendered? Are we not told that "it behoved Christ to suffer"?—that "Christ must needs have suffered" in order to enter into His glory—nay, that "the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through suffering"? That is so; and the reason is, that there can be no atonement effected without suffering. Suffering is the unavoidable accompaniment of expiation—the inevitable experience of a piacular process. Suffering is *not the end* or object sought for in itself: it is not the final aim on the part of God, as if that were the thing to drive at or aspire to: suffering is but the accessory experience which of necessity is entailed in and under the work of propitiation. Suffering was not the purpose, but the province of the cross: it was the inter-medium through which Christ had to pass in accomplishing His work. *The purpose of the cross of Christ was to take away sin;* and He could do this only "by the sacrifice of Him-

Digitized by Google

self"; and this sacrifice of necessity caused suffering. A father has pain inflicted upon him when he is called upon to discharge the debts contracted by a wayward and extravagant son; but it would be an utter misrepresentation of the case to say that the endurance of this pain was the purpose of the father's interposition. No! the purpose is the removal of the incumbrance created by the son, and the pain is simply the infliction which this removal entails. We see, therefore, what the cross of Christ is not, as an aim or intention to be fulfilled; for that aim or intention did not consist in suffering. Suffering was not the point in which Paul exulted, when he gloried in the cross of Christ.

I ask, then, emphatically, what was this cross? Did it consist in Christ's humiliation? Humiliation, no doubt, comprehended or embraced what is called the cross; but humiliation is not synonymous with the cross. Humiliation is a general term for Christ's coming in the flesh, and consisted in what we call the incarnation, or the assumption to Himself of our own human body, and therewith of the rational soul which ever accompanies this, as a living body; but all this was preliminary and preparatory to the cross. There could have been no cross apart from the humiliation of Christ. The humiliation of Christ (we are told) consisted in the fact of Christ having been born a man, and in a low condition as man—in the fact, therefore, of His being as man, made under the law which pertained to man, and, therefore, subject to the demands which the Divine law made upon man; and hence in the fact of His undergoing the miseries incident to human life under these circumstances, *i.e.*, the retribution of the Divine law upon this incarnation. The humiliation of Christ no doubt im-

Digitized by Google

plies and involves what is meant by the cross; but, more particularly, the humiliation of Christ is *the foundation* on which alone the cross can be manifested. The humiliation of Christ was demanded in order to the display of manhood, and so demanded that the obstacles placed in the way of man to the prosecution of the spiritual life, should in all their prevalence and power be placed in the way of Christ; and it behoved that, for this end, Christ should "in all things be made like unto His brethren," that He might be able, through the temptations which He encountered and overcame, to succour and sustain them that are tempted.

What, then, is the cross to which our Lord was subjected? I answer, at once:—*It was the free and full play upon Him of those obstructions which, under the incarnation, went to restrain the free prosecution of the spiritual life;* and it was the province of Jesus Christ to face these, and to withstand these, and to take them out of the way. These restraints upon spiritual life were brought to bear upon Him, and He felt them: they were great stumbling blocks which were placed in His path, and He had to say to them, as if they were mountains, "be ye removed, and be ye cast into the sea". He spake and it was done.

Let us, however, come to particulars, and let us ascertain what were the precise antagonisms to which Jesus was subjected, as the cross, which came in the way to thwart the life of God in the soul of man. There are three great sources from which this sore evil bears upon man: these are the devil, the world, and the flesh, and it was absolutely essential that Christ should have full experience of them all, in order to a full consciousness of the cross.

Digitized by Google

There was first the direct, yet subtle opposition of Satan when Christ entered on His public ministry. We cannot say much about the private life of Christ. There was probably much smaller scope in private life for the evil one to operate upon and to influence Christ, in that he could hope to impose no efficient obstacles but what would be readily overcome, in the retired family home at Nazareth, or in the social relation of the workshop of Joseph the carpenter; and it would seem as if Satan had reserved all his strength for a coming opportunity. Be that as it may, we are assured that the private life of our Lord had been without a stain; for when He went to be baptized in the Jordan by John the Baptist, the voice from heaven was heard saying—"This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased". Let it be understood, that every facility was permitted to Satan to endeavour as much as in him lay to seduce Christ. Facility had been granted to him to interfere with the first Adam, and no restriction was imposed so that he should not also interfere with the second Adam. The plan of God, in making man, involved this—that man must be able to withstand any amount of extraneous temptation to disobey, which could be brought against him; for, unless this could be achieved, the work of God could not be regarded as finally perfect. Man, when he came from the hands of his Maker, was as perfect as it was possible to make him; but he was not in the circumstances able to withstand the machinations of Satan to seduce him: this ultimate perfectioning of man had to be deferred to a future opportunity. Accordingly, the second Adam was introduced, not only for the purpose of repairing the evil brought into the world by the first Adam, but for

Digitized by Google

encountering any amount of temptation which the devil might bring to bear upon him. Well, as we have seen, Satan having fully succeeded in altering the divine course of life imposed upon our first parents, in that he brought them under the sway of carnal impulses, was duly on the alert to put forth all his strength for the self-same end on Jesus Christ; and more especially as Jesus Christ came for the express purpose of wresting the world out of the hands of Satan, and of fixing it more immediately under His own dominion.

The favourable circumstances, for which Satan waited, were duly afforded to him. Satan had probably required that Jesus should be taken out of the way from the haunts of man, and that He should be left in the wilderness for a time in utter loneliness. He would be enabled thereby to approach Him no doubt as an angel of light, full of sympathy, and manifesting zeal to support His plans and to forward His wishes. Satan would by and by have his own plans matured, and first of all he would adopt the tactics by which he had succeeded with the first Adam; and these were to bring about a derangement of Christ's purposes through the cravings of the body. All he here desired was that Jesus should be subjected to the pangs of hunger. This state is produced. Here lay Satan's opportunity; and he no doubt thought he must succeed. He had already heard from Jesus the expression of His Father's love for His children; why, then, should *He* be distressed by the gnawing appetency of hunger, and left to starve in a place where no food was to be found? Did not God know that His beloved Son had the means of creating the necessary supply for Himself? Why, then, should He be in any trouble in a matter of this sort?

Digitized by Google

What could be easier than to command the stones to become bread? This would be at once a signal manifestation of power, while it would be an immediate relief from pain. But what was the reply of Jesus? It was tantamount to this: that as He had been led into this situation by the Spirit of God, so He would do nothing till taken out of it by the Spirit of God. How the hunger of Jesus was relieved we are not told; but this obstruction, so cunningly laid by Satan, did not interrupt in the slightest the confidence and constancy of Jesus to His Father in heaven.

The devil bethought himself now, whether he might not work through this deep-seated confidence in God; and this, in connection with the desire of Jesus to be a Teacher and Leader of the people. Finding Jesus ready to listen to any proposals which might seem to promote the cause He had so deeply at heart, he takes Him to the lofty battlement of the temple, and pointing to the multitudes treading the courts beneath, he in effect says to Him: "See how you may obtain the acclamations of the people. If you will cast yourself from hence, no harm can befall *you;* and the people will stand around you with wonder and with awe; and they will thus listen to your voice, and you will become the Leader of men". Jesus felt that to yield to such a proposal, instead of exhibiting confidence in God, would only be displaying great presumption. In the first place, God had warranted no such proposal; and in the second place, it would have been an appeal to the sentiment of wonder alone, for the purpose of drawing man to Him—an appeal that could not consist with the dignity and majesty of a messenger of God. Accordingly, Jesus replied that it was not in Him thus to tempt God. This

Digitized by Google

second trap, therefore, which Satan laid to ensnare Him was equally futile with the first.

Satan had one other arrow in his quiver, and he determined to use it. He knew that the great object of Christ was to get possession of the world—to have the mastery of it, and entire jurisdiction over it. He therefore takes Jesus up to the top of a very lofty mountain, commanding distant views, and inferring still further scenes, where the inhabitants of the world were congregated in their various activities: "All these (said he) are *mine*, and on one condition you may have the whole as *thine*. The condition is, that you acknowledge me as the giver, and worship me accordingly." This was too much for Jesus, and repudiating him with the greatest scorn, He exclaimed: "Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve". Such were the direct trials of the cross brought by the personal effort of Satan, and thus was the tempter baffled in his cunning wiles to interrupt the free and full spiritual service of our Lord, under the most trying situation in which He came to be placed.

But the trials to which Christ was subjected, were not hereby ended: the *personal* efforts of Satan to trepan Him were ended. Christ was now handed over to a different department, where endeavours would be made in various ways to cross His purposes and to thwart His intentions. Christ was now committed to the Jewish community to be dealt with by them. Christ had panted much to secure these to Himself, that He might reign over them, and was willing to be called "the King of the Jews". Alas! "He came to His own, but His own received Him not".

Digitized by Google

You know what kind of people they were; you know how strongly they were bound to their religious prejudices—how implicitly they clung to their traditions—how satisfied they were with a religion of mere forms, and how opposed they were to aught that would curtail the current of their natural dispositions: you know, moreover, how bigoted were the rulers of the Jews, how exacting in their authority as teachers, how intolerant they were of contradiction, nay, how maddened they were against any subversion of their claims. You also know how different were the principles of the Lord Jesus, and how opposite was the tendency of His teaching. It was not possible, therefore, that Jesus could escape being crossed in His public teaching among such a people. It was unavoidable, His coming into collision with them; and we know how He had to bear the cross in all His intercourse with them. He had to bear the cross in the disappointment He experienced as to His want of success among them as a teacher; and He had also to bear the cross in His constant exposure to persecution at their hands.

As regards the opposition which they offered to His teaching, it was of the most determined sort. No doubt they were perplexed when they beheld the miracles which He wrought. They could not deny the facts, but they hated the doctrines which He propounded; and this hatred overwhelmed every other principle of their reason. While some allowed that the Messiah, when He came, could not do more miracles than Jesus did, and that *He* must needs be one sent by God, the Pharisees propounded the idea that Christ was in league with devils, and that "He cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils". And so prejudiced did they

Digitized by Google

become against the things which He spake, that even the few followers which He had obtained as disciples, began to leave Him; and so much did He feel the want of success attending His public teaching, that He said to the twelve whom He had chosen to be apostles, "Will ye also go away?" Though He went from place to place in the spirit of unlimited beneficence, healing their sick and curing their lame ones, giving sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb, and cleansing the lepers, and even raising the dead to life, yet He lived in the midst of those that were His bitter foes. No doubt multitudes followed Him, and especially when He fed the hungry in the wilderness; but they were actuated by the worldly and carnal selfishness of their nature, and had no sympathy with the deep spirituality which characterized Him. How few were converts to the self-denying principles which He proclaimed. And was not this deadness of heart to the things which He spake, a grievous trial to Him, a drawback in the prosecution of the great purpose for which He came. So little was the progress which He made as a teacher, so little even among the chosen ones who more immediately surrounded His person, that it was enough to make an ordinary man give up in despair of ever gaining the hearts of this stiff-necked people to have faith in the truths which He delivered. This cross, then, Jesus had to bear; but He was not to be daunted thereby; and He persevered in spite of every obstacle to the contrary.

But this was not all. Not only did they turn a deaf ear to His teaching, but they bent a malignant aspect to His person. The priests and rulers sent forth men to entrap Him in His speech, that they might find oppor-

Digitized by Google

tunity to enter accusations against Him: they plotted in every way to secure His ruin; and He had ever and anon to contrive how He should escape from falling into their murderous grasp. It seemed not only that there was no possibility of His gaining any ascendancy as a teacher over them, which (as I have noted) was to Him a grievous cross; but that there was no hope of His escaping a persecution, that must terminate in death itself, and crush, humanly speaking, the last forlorn hope.

You know the sequel. You know how they carried out their wicked intentions in the most violent and offensive form, not only by the cruel indignities which took place at His trial, but when they nailed Him to the tree, and so accomplished their hostile machinations against Him. Here was the cross in its most painful form, a cross that must have terminated for ever all hope on the part of any ordinary man. The cross of Calvary savoured very much of the aspect which the gallows presents among us; and, accordingly, that fact was a shameful conclusion which, while He recoiled from it as applicable to His name, was detrimental to His cause; for it was a stumbling block to the Jews, and a subject of laughter to the Greeks. Jesus knew all these drawbacks, yet He persevered in the fulfilment of His mission, undaunted by the cold-hearted difficulties and afflictions and dangers which encompassed Him.

Yet, farther: this did not comprehend all the cross which Jesus had to bear. There was yet a very material and needful accession to the cross, which Jesus had to endure—an accession not so readily seen by man, and not so readily allowed by us—a cross which had reference to the discipline which Jesus had per-

Digitized by Google

sonally to undergo. We are not willing to admit the idea of discipline as applicable to Jesus, in as far as we become so absorbed by the persuasion of His divinity, as the prevailing power of His being; but we lose hereby one of the profoundest secrets of the cross which He bore, and one of the most invaluable principles of the cross, as applicable to ourselves. To ignore the fact of discipline as expedient for Christ is to shut our eyes to the most obvious teaching of holy Scripture. It seems nothing short of denying that true, real manhood which He came to share with ourselves; and to deny this, seems to me to deny the very grounds on which He stands forth as an atoning Saviour; for what is atonement but *the removal from the person of man of those obstructions to the spiritual life, which constitute an offence unto God.* If Christ did not partake what is ours, then it is clear that He could not represent our case before God. I know of no greater danger, therefore, as attachable to the Church of Christ, than that dogma which exempts Him from sharing our humanity in its deepest considerations; for how, apart from this, could He exercise the office of priest, which consists in the offering up of a sacrifice that is acceptable to God, as being the removal of that which is offensive unto God. It behoved, therefore, that Christ should undergo that personal discipline which we are taught, carried Him on to "perfection". If we question that Christ underwent discipline, we must question that He was a man of prayer. The fact, however, that Jesus was constant in prayer, cannot be disputed; and if it be said that the prayers were not personal to Himself, I quote the saying: "Father, save Me from this hour". I quote the language, too, of the inspired author of the Hebrews,

Digitized by Google

telling us that, "in the days of His flesh He offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him out of death, and was heard for His godly fear". And that He underwent a needful discipline is asserted in these plain and unambiguous words, "though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered". And farther, we are told that through this discipline He was "perfected" for becoming our Redeemer and Saviour. "And having been made perfect (says the same author) He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him."

Why, if Christ Jesus had been without discipline, He must have been without the fundamental essentials of saviourship, those essentials which constituted the work given Him to do, in the actual recovery of humanity from the grasp of the evil one. If, moreover, Christ had been without discipline, of necessity He must have been without merit; for what is merit but a cleaving to virtue and to righteousness, when contrary influences are brought to bear upon us, in which case, we set an example which should be followed by others. If there was one thing more than another in which it behoved the blessed Saviour to participate, it was in this, that He had our humanity in its deepest momenta; and this humanity, too, in order that He might purify and sanctify it; and so, in His own person first of all, present a humanity to God worthy of God, and fitted for partaking of the divine glory. Never shall we understand the work of Christ, nor the doctrine of the cross, unless we acquire a keen "discernment of the Lord's body," as well as a true understanding of the connection

Digitized by Google

and communion which the body of necessity has with the soul.

It does not for a moment follow that Jesus was personally a partaker of sin, because He partook essentially of what belongs to us. That He had what is ours, only indicated that He laid hold of the very roots of our being; and this we are told in language which cannot be misunderstood, when it is said that it "behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren in all things". And so specific is the inspired author on this point, that it seems as if he strained language to the uttermost to make it manifest. "Forasmuch as the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself, *in like manner*, partook of the same"; and he tells us the precise object of this participation was this, *viz.*, that by death (*i.e.*, the death of this body of flesh and blood as a living power, and so destroying its dominion in the soul) He might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. This explains to us the nature of Christ's great work in undoing the very evil which Satan had brought in by the fall.

But all this only the more profoundly sets before us the cross which Christ had to endure. Having human affections and human impulses, it behoved Him to have a human will—a will, too, prompted by those desires which have their seat and their source in the flesh. And it is here that we have to draw the line of demarcation which separated Him from sin. We know, in ourselves, how common it is for desires to shew themselves as craving for gratification before the mind or intelligence, when, on their presenting themselves, *i.e.*, when their characteristics are perceived, they are at once quenched or crushed on the arena of the soul, and

Digitized by Google

have thus no longer any place in the soul. This must have been very emphatically the case with respect to the Lord Jesus; and this interprets to us the sentiment which tells us that He "came, not to do His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him, and to finish His work". There is said to be a will in man, so far as he is prompted by what comes from the flesh; and were there no counteracting agency, that will (so-called) would constitute his volition and the characteristic of his being, even as it is so found in the mere animal economy. But in man, when duly educated, there arises on every occasion a watchful guardian over every impulse thus suborned from the flesh; which watchful guardian, as the source of moral law in the soul, gives forth the *ought* or the *ought not* in respect of such impulse; and the dominion of the *ought* and *ought not*, therefore, constitutes the true characteristic of the inner man. It is not sin, therefore, when there is simply the presentation of a sinful impulse before the mind: it only becomes sin when the watchful guardian I have here referred to, as having the prerogative of *the ought* and *the ought not*, fails to exercise its function, or becomes itself unclean, so as to countenance what is wrong. None who ever trode the surface of our world in human flesh ever had the prerogative of the *ought* and *ought not* in greater clearness or in greater purity than the Lord Jesus; and here was His position that, while He was tempted, even as we are tempted, by what comes from the flesh, yet "the law of the Spirit of life," I now speak of, as in Him, was so efficient, as to be the perfect guardian of the soul in regard to the non-permission of sin, as an ingredient in the soul.

Now, see in all this the cross, which Christ had

Digitized by Google

personally to bear, as touching the overthrow of all that is sinful, and the inbringing of a full and perfect righteousness on the soul. Some would tell you that, if it be admitted that impulses came from the body of Christ, which if left to themselves would engender sin, that, therefore, Christ had personally sin. There never was a greater mistake; and James tells us that this is a great mistake, in that *he* only is described as a sinner who is "*drawn away by his own lust and enticed*". The fact, then, of there being a craving expressed before the mind, does not constitute sin; but what says James? "Lust, *when it hath conceived*, bringeth forth sin"; that is, when the soul hath received the desire and harboured the desire, and favoured the desire, which is unclean, *then, but then only*, doth the soul bear sin. The note of an old and judicious commentator on this passage confirms what I here endeavour to explain. His words are: "The desires or lustings of the sensual appetite put us only under a state of temptation; not of actual sin: they are, indeed, the root of sin; but so is any temptation to sin, and [so are] the suggestions of Satan. *They are not our sins till we consent to them:* they are not a transgression of the law; for there is no [moral] law given to the sensual appetite alone, but to the whole man; who, while he cannot hinder sensual appetites from arising in him before he perceives them, can yet restrain the will from consenting to them, so soon as he does perceive them; and can refuse to admit of them to make any stay in, or gain on, his mind—to contemplate them—with delight or assent to them; and this being all he can do, must be all he is obliged to by the law." (Whitby on James i. 15.)

All this hath an important bearing on the work which

Digitized by Google

Jesus Christ had to perform, and the cross which He endured in making an atonement for sin. If Jesus had our human body (and all Scripture declares that He had) then had He the presentations, which are common to human bodies upon human souls, and which are derived from human bodies, the lusts of which bear on human souls, when presentations coming forward as cravings, or as impulses in some form or other, do constitute of necessity assaults on the soul. But in Christ there was an ever-watchful guardian over all presentations coming up, whether from the flesh or from the world—a guardian which, in His case, peculiarly gave Him, in the first place, full and perfect understanding as to the character and consequences of every emotion from the lower nature, or from the outside world; and, in the second place, operated as a complete check upon things unworthy, to keep them aloof from contaminating the soul. The process of checking or curbing or restraining (a process with which all are familiar who know what is meant by self-denial) constituted the cross whereby Christ preserved Himself from all sin, and withered sin in its very source and fountain-head. The possession by Christ of the Spirit in all fulness enabled Him to minister this watchful dominion over motions from beneath, and gave Him authority in Himself to dismiss whatever was not consistent with thorough righteousness. And how often must there have been pain in His case, in so absolute an application of the cross.

We may obtain illustrations of what we here affirm, by taking passages almost at random in the life of Christ. On one occasion, the multitude were desirous to make Him a King: they would even force Him to

Digitized by Google

accept this honour. Here was a movement in the direction of that relationship which Christ above all things desired, a movement very flattering to the flesh, a movement which, if yielded to, would have given to Christ a commanding influence over them as a community; but when the proposal was submitted to the analysis of the Spirit, which ruled in Him, it was summarily rejected. It would have placed Him upon a false pedestal, in that the kingdom offered to Him was a temporal kingdom, having mere earthly sway, whereas His kingdom consisted in the dominion of God's spirit in the soul. The cross, therefore, was applied to such an offer.

Take another case. On one occasion the Samaritans declined to receive Him, because His face was as if He were going to Jerusalem. This declinature was felt by James and John to be a direct insult upon their Master; and its natural effect was to excite indignation, and they asked Him, therefore, whether they ought not to call down fire from heaven to consume them. This only shows how the moral faculty is blunted, when left to the operation of the natural man. The tendency of the natural man is to render evil for evil; and the moral check is, in such circumstances, wanting to repress the spirit of retaliation. Not so in Christ. The spirit of Christ rebuked, counteracted, and smothered such an emotion. Christ understood perfectly the impulse which in such circumstances presented itself, but in Himself it was permitted to have no quarter; and the feeling with which He regarded it, is seen in the language which He addressed to James and John, to smother and subdue such untoward indignation.

Another response of an opposite character on the part

Digitized by Google

of Peter met with a still severer chastisement, which almost creates surprise. When Christ intimated to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and "suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed and raised again the third day," we are told that Peter remonstrated against this, as the most impious cruelty; his soul loathed the idea of his kind and indulgent Master being so ignominiously and malignantly treated, and under the impulse of this virtuous indignation, Peter ventured to rebuke the proposal, and said—"Be this far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee". Obviously the exclamation of Peter was a mark of the strong attachment which he bore to his Master, and a recoilment from the barbarous usage which the Lord's words indicated. One would have thought, therefore, that the zeal of Peter in these circumstances would have brought up rather a kindly response from Jesus, as knowing the implicit belief that Peter had that He was the Christ, and the ready fearlessness with which Peter himself would face any danger, in the assurance that his Master must overcome. But instead of a tender response acknowledging the attachment of Peter, Jesus with unwonted severity turned and said unto Peter—"Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto Me; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men". Never did Jesus speak with greater sternness and austerity. How can this be explained? On one principle alone can we account for it; but that one principle perfectly accounts for it. We know full well that Jesus Himself had personally the greatest unwillingness and repugnance to face the contemplated trials which were before Him, and that He looked upon them with loathing and with horror.

Digitized by Google

When, therefore, the Apostle expressed what but coincided with the recalcitration that operated in His own bosom, and felt, so to speak, a giving way to the honest expostulations of His Apostle, the fire of the Spirit immediately breaks forth at this, as the most dangerous moment of His ordeal,—dangerous in this, that to have listened to it, would have stained for ever the glorious work which He had come to fulfil. Hence the peremptory rigour with which He rebuked Peter, as placing "a stumbling-block" in His way,—a rigour which betokened the plenary operation of the Spirit, in subduing the most powerful emotions of the flesh.

I shall but touch on one passage more, and this explanatory of the sacrificial process of His career. As Jesus went on His way through the villages in His journeying to Jerusalem, "there came certain Pharisees saying to Him, Get Thee out and go hence: for Herod would fain kill Thee". To this He gives a very remarkable answer; it was as follows: "Go and say to that fox, behold I cast out devils, and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected". At first consideration, one has difficulty in seeing what bearing these words have upon the threat of Herod to *kill* Him; but it has, in its intrinsic significance, a very close collateral relation to the life-destroying tactics which He was Himself pursuing. He had taught very pointedly that "he that saved his life should lose it, and that he who should lose his life in this world should save it to life eternal"; and He Himself practised most emphatically what He preached. When, therefore, He heard that Herod entertained the design of putting Him to death, it is obvious that a feeling of indignation was aroused against Herod; but this feeling was permitted

Digitized by Google

to have indulgence no further than to point to Herod as "that fox,"—as one who would stealthily do any deed of violence to serve some selfish purpose of his own. But as regards *killing*, Jesus would intimate that He was Himself discharging that office in the manner that must prove most effective for good. The dogmata or decrees of the flesh He would pronounce as "devils" or demons, in as far as they were the powers which rose up to carry away the soul; and the destruction of them as devils cast out, He would describe as "cures"—cures not to be effected in a day, but certainly in the course of the time allotted to Him. It is in this sense that Paul speaks of Jesus as "stripping Himself of principalities and powers" (Col. ii. 15),—a sense more literally expressed when the same Apostle speaks of His "abolishing the enmity in His flesh" (Eph. ii. 15), and which constituted the sacrificial life of Christ; for it behoved Him to have this sacrifice to offer in order to the assertion of His priesthood; and He did have it, but only by the assumption of our body of human flesh. That He had it, is asserted, among other texts, by the saying that "God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as touching the element of sin (περὶ ἁμαρτιας) he condemned sin in the flesh". In respect, therefore, of *killing*, Jesus could declare that He was Himself performing that function upon Himself, and that until that consummation was completely attained He would not regard Himself as "perfected". Perfected He was, when upon the Cross He exclaimed—"It is finished". Then was the body of the flesh sacrificed in the most absolute form: then could He go to the tomb in attestation of this final overthrow of the flesh: then would He be prepared for being lifted up in a body of flesh spiritua-

Digitized by Google

lised for immortality: then would He enter into Heaven as "the King of Glory": then would He carry His manhood with Him to participate of that glory, which He had with the Father before the world was.

Do you see, then, in what the cross of Christ consisted? It consisted not in the mere application of pain to the body of the flesh, nor in any mere anguish of mind coming through that or any other channel; for anguish and sorrow, as mere *ultimata*, *i.e.*, as things needed for completing the phenomena to be aimed at in the life of Christ, were never (we conceive) projected in the desires and decrees of God. No! the crowning or consummating object of Christ was "the putting away of sin"; and, as I have said, pain and sorrow were but the inevitable ingredients of the process whereby that final object was to be obtained. The cross of Christ consisted simply in sacrifice—not that which arose merely from the obstacles placed in His way by the father of lies, and by a world that lieth in wickedness, but through these, and in connection with these, in the absolute control which He exercised over the lower nature, and in the absolute subserviency to the spiritual nature to which the lower nature was reduced,—a subserviency in which the lower nature came freely to acquiesce in the most difficult and most trying of all situations—that of its absolute destruction.

In expounding the doctrine of the Cross, then, I have to observe that the life of Christ was one great holocaust, whereby he denied Himself to all that pertains to the desires of the manhood as living in the flesh, and bound thereby to the world as the nourisher and supporter of these desires. Christ did, in His own person, lay the axe to the root of all that is carnal and

Digitized by Google

worldly; and unsparingly did he cut up, root and branch, every vestige of carnal tendency and carnal assault upon the soul: in short, he so sapped the foundations of sin, and so completely plucked it up by the roots, that the sufferings which were unavoidable in the execution of this work—sufferings for which God had no relish of satisfaction when looked at by themselves, yet in the circumstances, as the taking away of sin, yielded a real satisfaction to God; or as the Apostle terms it, they were "the savour of a sweet smell unto God". Yes! the sufferings of Christ indicated the expenditure to which he had been put, in the abolishment or expulsion of sin, in order to the inbringing of a pure and perfect righteousness; but as will be seen, the sufferings as such could be no atonement to God. That only could be an atonement to God which took away the thing that was offensive in His eyes, and restored the constitution of man to that spiritual harmony which was in oneness with Himself. Christ Jesus, then, in giving up His body to be sacrificed—(a sacrifice which, so far as His public career is concerned, began in His banishment from home and in His transference to the lonely wilderness—a sacrifice which was continued day by day in every variety which the alternation of circumstances brought on, and which was terminated only in the climax of the Cross of Calvary)—laid that foundation for salvation "other than which no man can lay,"—a foundation which, like the rock of ages, will support every possible erection which can be built thereon.

The cross of Christ is a representation of what Christ is. It fails in its purpose if it has not its application to the followers of Christ. This application, I rejoice to

Digitized by Google

know, is much insisted on by the Church of which we are members. You are all familiar with the question of our Shorter Catechism which asks: "How are we made partakers of the Redemption purchased by Christ?" And the answer which is given, you well know: "We are made partakers of the Redemption purchased by Christ, by the effectual *application* of it to us by His Holy Spirit". This application, the Catechism explains, as constituted through the operation of faith in us, whereby we are *united to Christ* in our effectual calling. This "uniting of ourselves to Christ," that is, *an identification of ourselves with Christ,* is incompatible with the doctrine of substitution of which we hear so much, and on which so many depend, to their grievous injury, as I think. I will not say that the *Confession of Faith* is always consistent with itself on this great question; for while it proclaims the great truth we all hold, that we are justified before God by "receiving and resting on Christ and on His righteousness," it in the same breath says, that "God justifieth, not by infusing righteousness, but by pardoning sins". I should like to know how anyone can receive and rest upon the righteousness of Christ, otherwise than by having the righteousness of Christ infused into him. If faith in Jesus Christ be the *receiving* of Christ, then Christ is said to dwell in the receiver. And the Apostle says, that "Christ in me is the hope of glory". This repudiation of an infused righteousness necessitates the dogma of substitution; but if faith is anything at all, it implies an infused righteousness, and the *Confession of Faith* returns to the truth when it says, that we "are not justified until the Holy Spirit doth in due time actually *apply* Christ unto us". The doctrine, then,

Digitized by Google

which properly demands the *application* of Christ and His righteousness to us in order to our justification, is (I hold) inconsistent with that which bears on the *substitution* of Christ for us; for, granting for a moment the idea of substitution as substantiated, it may well be asked, what is its value if there be no justification (as the *Confession* most plainly insists) till Christ is *actually applied to us?*

What says the key-note to this chapter? We have therein the expression "by whom": in the margin it is "whereby"; and our recent translators have made it "*through which* the world hath been crucified unto me and I unto the world". This latter is alone the sound and correct view, because it is the cross of Christ that is referred to by the Apostle, and not Christ, as apart from the cross, that constitutes the ground of that fundamental change, which is spoken of as brought about in the Apostle. He tells us herein, that by *the cross* of Christ the world hath been crucified unto him and he unto the world. The former condition follows as a necessary consequence of the latter. If Paul became crucified to the world, it behoved that the world should be practically crucified unto him. And this is explained when he elsewhere says, "I am dead with Christ," that is, Paul died even as Christ died—died to sin, that he might live unto righteousness; and the text tells us that this death took place "through the cross," that is, through the application of the cross. Apart from the *application* to us of the cross, Christ (Yes! Christ crucified) is, and must be, but a mere name to us. Apart from the *application* of the cross there is a great gulf betwixt us and Christ; Christ, in that case, is little more than an historical fact. We may believe in Him as

Digitized by Google

having lived and died according to the Scriptures, and we may believe in Him as having purchased heaven for us, and presented the glories of heaven to us as a free gift; but after all, if we are not brought under the cross (and the cross, too, as the expulsion of sin, in order to the infusion of righteousness, which infusion alone constitutes the regenerated man), where is the personal benefit?

Can we get to heaven if we have no qualification for heaven? Or can we have any title to heaven that is not contained in the qualification? Can we separate the title from the qualification? We are told that the title consists in the payment by Christ of debts due by us, and that utterly irrespective of anything inwrought in us, or done by us: we fully admit that Christ, apart from us, and long ere we were born, achieved a glorious victory over sin and over Satan, and that He brought in a perfect righteousness on the manhood, *i.e.*, as St. Peter expresses it, "He was put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the spirit"; but all this, not as a substitute for us, but as a representative of us, that is, as constituting that new manhood, out of which we are begotten anew in His image and likeness. We cannot, therefore, separate the title from the qualification; for, in so doing, we, in point of fact, upset and destroy the doctrine of justification by faith. If Christ paid the debts, that is, pardoned the sins, of the saved ones by the fact of His dying on the cross, then it follows (it must follow) that our sins are pardoned before they are committed, nay, pardoned before we are born into the world, pardoned, therefore, irrespective of our faith and repentance; and the doctrine of justification by faith is thus practically erased. We may not thus be involved

Digitized by Google

in a practical contradiction. We must better understand under what circumstances our sins are pardoned, and our souls are accepted by God.

We avow and aver that our sins are pardoned and our souls are accepted by the application of the cross of Christ, and through this exclusively. We do not question the great fact that it is Christ Who pays our debts —that it is through the money of Christ that we have any claim to a place in heaven; but let it be understood that His money is expended upon us *now*, and that through this money of which we are the partakers, in receiving what is His, we have at once a title and a qualification for heaven. The money of Christ may well be termed the blood of Christ; and it is the blood of Christ which alone imparts the life of Christ; and how is this imparted otherwise than by the sprinkling of it for our purification? There is much misconception attached to this very important term, "the blood". We forget that we are living in a purely *spiritual* dispensation—spiritual as contrasted with the dispensation of material things under the law. Under the law they had their sacrificial victims; and they had to learn the great lesson of atonement through "the letter," *i.e.*, by the *material* blood of the victim "made sin,"—thereby teaching the necessity of the death of sin, as the very foundation of acceptance with God; and what was the sprinkling of the blood of atonement under the law, but the symbol of its *application* to the sinner for his acceptance with God. They had to learn divine sentiments from the material symbols provided by the ceremonials of the law. The full significance of those symbols was exhibited, only when the body of Jesus Christ was offered up. His sacrifice, which was begun

Digitized by Google

in the wilderness, and consummated on Calvary, was the closing up and completion of an economy of material things. Henceforward the blood of Christ constituted the ingredient of spiritual life, and His body the foundation of spiritual nourishment. In other words, the body and the blood of Christ are in the present dispensation the spiritual essentials of which we must be sharers, in order to the impartation of that new life, which constitutes the regenerated manhood, prepared for the glory which is to follow. And the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are the material symbols of that participation in the proclamation of the spiritual things of Christ, *i.e.*, in the preaching of the Word—all indicating that the body and the blood of Christ are spiritual realities in the dispensation of the new covenant.

But what stronger argument can be employed to shew the necessity of having the *application* of Christ crucified to us—an application which, if it means anything, means this, that we must "drink of the cup which Christ drank, and be baptized with the baptism which He was baptized with". If there was one aim beyond another, in the career of the Apostle Paul, it was "that he might be conformed to the death of Christ"—that death, which abolished the old man of sin, as preliminary and preparatory to the inbringing of the new man of righteousness—a death which does not involve any violent overthrow *at the hands of men*, as Christ underwent when He was nailed to the tree, but which involves the death of carnal lusts, as characteristic of the life of the natural man.

This death, however, is the very cross which is hateful to the natural man. No other cross can be. That

Digitized by Google

cross is of necessity distasteful and abhorrent which takes away the life of the natural man as such. No creature that has life, but clings to its life; and the life, which is natural to man in the world, is no exception to the general rule. Hence the exercise of ingenuity the most subtle, to set aside this grand truth—an ingenuity that pretends deep concern for the honour and glory of Christ, in order to get quit of this crushing self-denial, which the application of the cross necessitates. We are told it is for the honour of Christ that the gift of eternal life should be free and unmerited, being begun in the pure forgiveness of the sinner's sins; and we ask, does it in the slightest degree derogate from this characteristic of absolute gratuity, when we say, that throughout the whole process of the application of the cross, the motive power of God lies at the foundation, and that to the influences brought to bear on man for his recovery, all is exclusively due to divine interposition, as fulfilled through human instrumentality.

It may be said that we hereby make the pardon of sin to be no longer an act performed at once, but a work continuously going on, and that we hereby confound justification with sanctification. In reply, I have to say, if justification and sanctification are inseparable, as they are admitted to be, that justification, as an act, cannot be effected apart from, much less preliminary to, sanctification as a work. If I were to distinguish the two by any express definition, I would say, that *justification is the pronouncement of God's satisfaction*, while *sanctification shews the range or degree of the believer's advancement.* Both are acquired through faith. Through faith we receive the things of Christ, and the

Digitized by Google

things of Christ give us our *title*, while they also operate in our souls as the *qualifying and regenerating power*. "Whereto we have already attained" in the acquisition of Christ, thereby do we actually stand. "According to your faith be it unto you," is the sentiment enunciated by our Lord. Whatever range in the divine life we have reached (and this always implies a corresponding stoppage of the carnal life), there we rank; that is, God pronounces upon us accordingly, and we have our place in heaven assigned to us accordingly.

How simple (as it appears to us) is the economy of the Gospel of Christ. The doctrine of the cross, I repeat, is but a representation of what Christ is. It is man who has mystified and complicated that doctrine: it is man who hath put a stumbling-block in the way of man, in describing that doctrine: it is man by his positing a justification in the dogma of substitution, who has introduced inconsistency and contradiction into the economy of grace; and worst of all, it is man who has devised a scheme of imputation whereby he shall look for heaven and hope for heaven, while yet pursuing the devices and desires of his own heart! What I say is,—*first*, that Jesus Christ, having become incarnate by taking to Himself our body of flesh and blood, it behoved him to become a sacrifice in respect of that flesh and blood, in order that the manhood thus assumed might be prepared for glorification and position at the right hand of the Father:—*second*, that Jesus Christ had in Himself the prerogative of thus offering up the needful sacrifice, in the fact that He was in possession of the Eternal Spirit, as holding the entire dominion over the soul, and preserving the soul from the contamination of sin:—

Digitized by Google

third, that having effectually put away sin by this sacrifice, that is, sin as it lurks in, and proceeds from, the framework of the flesh, and having in connection with this work, introduced a perfect righteousness upon the soul, He was set forth and established as the new man (the second Adam), adapted for the glorification referred to:—*fourth*, that having ascended to the throne of God above, His prerogative was to bestow the Spirit of God upon His Church, which He had instituted ere His personal departure from the earth, and that the grace hereby conferred should be the *very essence* of that which brought about His own perfection and exaltation:—*fifth*, that the essence here referred to, is that life-blood of Christ, which, constituting the ingredient of His own bosom, produceth an expulsion of sin on the one hand, and a growth of righteousness on the other:—*sixth*, that the blood of Christ is effectually sprinkled upon us, when by the law of terrors we are brought to repentance, and by the law of love we are made to exercise faith, and to be matured for glory, through the exercise of faith.

It was under such an economy as I have here faintly, but I trust faithfully, sketched, that Paul could say: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live," an economy which begun in the person of Christ, was conveyed and made applicable to the Church, as the mystical body of Christ. The body of Christ *mystical*, must be treated, even as the body of Christ *personal* was treated. In no other way can its regeneration be accomplished: through no other process can its glorification be attained. How needful, then, to have sound views of the cross, as the great central doctrine of the Gospel. We have yet to search our foundations more

Digitized by Google

profoundly, and to sift our formulas more efficiently, in order that the pure wheat of the Gospel may more assuredly be discovered. We have been accustomed to say, that Christ crucified has been "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness"; but how could it be otherwise, if both Jews and Greeks misunderstood the cross or have had the cross mistakingly presented to them. If we are ourselves found to entertain erroneous views respecting the cross, may it not be that the true views of the cross are offensive to us? We are too ready to set our eyes on a material cross, and on the penalties which it involves. I have only to say, in conclusion, that a material cross does but obscure the true significance of the Christian cross. In the cross of Christ, as apart from a material cross, we have a bright display of the Divine attributes: in the cross of Christ, so far as there is the material cross, we see the enmity of man and the enmity of Satan against the purity and prevalence of the divine life; but in the cross of Christ, as putting away sin, we see the hatred of God against sin, and the authority of God in the destruction of sin: in the cross of Christ we see the wisdom of God in His efforts to purify the human soul and to prepare it for a heavenly home: in the cross of Christ we see the abolishment of all carnal and worldly elements from having dominion in the heart, and we see also the preservation of the spiritual for everlasting glory; for therein we find the full assertion of the spiritual authority over all carnal and worldly ascendancy: in the cross of Christ we have the fulfilment of the divine intentions as a basis for the regeneration of man, and the foundation laid for the structure of a kingdom of righteousness. In the cross of Christ we

Digitized by Google

have a stupendous lesson read to the moral universe—a lesson which, however difficult to learn, is that whereby alone Satan can be discomfited, and Christ can be magnified: in the cross of Christ we have that provision for the human race which confers immortality on man, and without which redemption could be but a name. The cross of Christ, in its application to us, is the power of God unto salvation to every one that truly bears it. Let us then, like Paul, glory in the cross of Christ: let us be partakers of the cross of Christ: thus shall we be one with our risen Lord: thus shall the old nature pass away, and the new manhood shall be imparted to us: thus shall we be joined to Christ and be glorified with Christ to all eternity. This is the cross which alone will bear the analysis of reason, which keeps clear of the intellectual difficulties of substitution, which consists with the universal teaching of Scripture, and which goes truly to reform the world. Let it be ours to glory in this cross. Paul gloried in his infirmities when the power of God through these rested upon him; and for the same reason he gloried in tribulations, when the tribulation worked patience, and patience worked experience, and experience worked hope — hope that maketh not ashamed, when the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost. Paul did not, and could not, glory in aught that was merely human; for there was nothing of the earth earthy, in which, as such, he desired to glory. That kind of glorying was characteristic of the natural man. The prophet of old could point to what is very characteristic of the world, that the wise man should be found glorying in his wisdom, and the mighty man glorying in his might, and the rich man glorying in his riches, and every man

Digitized by Google

glorying in any qualification which distinguished him from his neighbour; but, says He, "let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth Me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things do I delight, saith the Lord". Loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness are the very opposites of the natural man, as the whole history of the world hath declared; and to practise these, demanded the introduction of the cross. To practise these, was to take up the cross, and, therefore, the Apostle gloried in the cross. He gloried in that which made him a new creature, he gloried in that which brought him into unison with Jesus Christ, he gloried in that which placed him in harmony with God, he gloried in that which brought heaven and immortality to him, with the unspeakable privileges of the life to come.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII.

THE REMISSION OF SINS.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."—ACTS II. 38.

"Repent ye and be converted that your sins may be blotted out."—ACTS III. 19.

"Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins."—ACTS V. 31.

"The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin."—1 JOHN I. 7.

"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins."—EPHESIANS I. 7.

"Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood."—REVELATIONS I. 5.

THERE can be no doubt, on Scripture-principles, that the remission of sins, which implies the forgiveness of sins, stands in immediate connection with, and flows directly from, the work of atonement: we must, therefore, understand the principles which constitute atonement, if we are to apprehend those on which the remission of sins doth hang. It is a magnificent subject; and it is all the more to be deplored, if in any important particulars it be misunderstood. Its due exposition can be had from the Holy Scriptures only;

Digitized by Google

but the due exposition of the Scriptures must be in harmony with two great laws, the consistency of Scripture with itself, and with well-ascertained truth.

This is what I call Reason. Some may decry reason; but reason is the gift of God, and we cannot dispense with it for a moment. Were it not for the gift of reason, neither the Scriptures nor God Himself could be of any consideration to us. We cannot interpret a single text, but our reason is employed: we cannot form a creed or, indeed, arrive at any conclusion, but reason is employed: we cannot properly accept a creed, but reason is employed: we cannot meet together and discuss doctrines, but as rational beings: nay, we cannot receive the Scriptures themselves, but in virtue of our reason; for while primarily we may, and do, receive them, because the authorities to which we are by nature subject, receive them; yet, if we would in after-life test that authority, we must try and test the evidence by which they are authenticated to us; and hereby only is the reason satisfied, that is, hereby do we know, that they come from God. It is obvious, then, that in discussing doctrines, we must needs employ and fairly task that great gift, which distinguishes man, as having in him the arbiter of truth, for weighing the grounds on which we determine conclusions. Only it behoves us always to see that in the exercise of reason, our conclusions are drawn from a legitimate source of knowledge; for unless the understanding be duly and soundly informed and instructed, it is impossible that the reason can fairly adjudge and determine.

What, then, is the grand source of instruction for the information of reason in solving the great problems of

Digitized by Google

Scripture? I answer, it is the Scriptures themselves. Scripture gives the facts: to them we appeal, and reason seeks for an explanation of the facts; and when facts are duly accumulated, reason gives the explanation desired. "Search the Scriptures (saith Christ), for in them ye think that ye have eternal life"; and this thought of eternal life being found in them He did not dispute, but rather encouraged it, for He adds, "they testify of Me". If the Old Testament bore witness to Christ, much more may we say that the New Testament does so; for it contains a direct record of the life of Christ, and brings an immediate transfer of the mind of Christ to the student who receives its revealments as the Word of God; and in as far as hereby we have the doctrines of Christ carried home to our minds and hearts, we have attained a picture of what Christ is, and so we become epistles of Christ.

And how will this experience set clearly before our minds the all-important and absorbing doctrine known as "the remission of sins"? The remission of sins is a term synonymous with the removal of sins, the putting away of sins, the blotting out of sins. This Jesus Christ is said to have effected; and if He is regarded (and properly so) as the Type, we have but to be conformed thereto—"conformed to His death," "bearing about with us the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Christ may be made manifest in our mortal bodies". This is the end for which the Christian dispensation is established. Through it we are taught the doctrine of sin, and the danger of sin: through it we are taught the doctrine of righteousness, and the reward attached to righteousness: through it we are taught that if our sins are taken away, the penalty of them is

Digitized by Google

taken away; and that if the righteousness of Christ is made ours, life and salvation are made ours. If our sins are taken away, and if they have no longer any dominion over us, then that which is offensive is taken out of the way, and the barrier to our reconciliation with God is removed, that is, the obstruction to the impartation of Christ's righteousness is removed, and there is no more any visitation for sin.

Such is the grand and glorious character of God! Only let the ground of God's alienation from man be removed, and it can be removed by the removal of the cause of it, then is God ready, as a kind and indulgent Father, to smile upon us, and to welcome us into the family-relation of His household, and to give us the privileges of that family relationship, *viz.*, the graces of the Holy Spirit, and so prepare us for the enjoyment of His presence in the eternal realizations of heaven.

There is no doubt that this question of the remission or the removal of sins involves the whole subject of atonement. Many volumes have been written on the atonement: I am not wrong when I say, not hundreds, but thousands of volumes have been published on this all-absorbing theme. And what does all amount to? It is felt still that something needs to be explained to the rational mind; for it is a question of cause and effect. We say that every effect must have an adequate cause, and that every cause must be attended with its own proper effect. This is a matter of invariable experience; and so far as I am able to pry into the question, it is a matter of reason also. It is a matter of reason that, as each ingredient has its own peculiar properties, which constitute its individuality, and can have nothing beyond what pertains to itself; so, when a

Digitized by Google

collection or combination of ingredients is associated, they can in reason produce nothing more than what is contained under their mutual embrace. Here, then, is a great result, *i.e.*, an effect produced, *viz.*, the removal or expurgation of sins—the grand problem given for the Church to solve is this, By what process is this phenomenon secured?

I have already noted that a simple definition of atonement, is that which secures first of all the remission of sins, the removal of sins, the forgiveness of sins; for these expressions have in reality one and the same meaning.[1] Mark then! if atonement signifies *the putting away of sins* (and that it does so, the Apostle most fully declares, when in describing Christ's atonement, he says that Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"), then here comes a very important question: *Is my sin put away, while I am wallowing in sin?* Would it not be a contradiction in terms to say so? But we practically fall into this very contradiction; and yet we seem to be contented. What is the general statement anent such a condition? A man readily acknowledges himself to be a sinner; and believing in the view of atonement that his sins are somehow accounted for and expunged, he is ready to blacken himself to the uttermost, and to say—that he is "a hell-deserving sinner"; but he adds, "my sins will never be imputed to me; they will never be accounted to me, because I am a believer in Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ (he says) has borne the penalty of my sin, and, therefore, I escape:—I escape because remission of sin means not the removal of actual sin, but the removal of the penalty of sin".

[1] See *Excursus* XXV., on Justification and Sanctification.

Digitized by Google

Hence the man is in peace and is satisfied. And being satisfied, he continues in his sins; and yet all the while he rests contented that he can, by some kind of imputation, lay them on the Lord Jesus Christ, and so escape the punishment due to them!

It will be well for us to see if this representation is consistent either with Holy Scripture or with any true and rational interpretation of Scripture. That such a course of thought exists extensively in the christian world, cannot be doubted, nay, cannot be questioned, when we contemplate the existing corruption of manners side by side with a professing christianity; for if ever it was true that many have a name as living in Christ, but are spiritually dead, it is in the present day.

Many a one reasons thus: 'In what does the remission of sin consist; and how is this remission effected? Am I not by New Testament teaching shut up to the conclusion that it is the penalty merely of sin which has been remitted to His people by the achievements of the Lord Jesus Christ? Did He not "suffer for us," that we who believe in Him might escape the penalty of our sins? Did He not "make atonement to God for us," that we might thereby be freed from condemnation? Did He not "pay the price" which the justice of God demanded in order to the release of the sinner? As He deserved no punishment for sin on His own account, being Himself "without sin," what alternative is there but to conclude that the penalty actually exacted of Him, was the very penalty due by us? Are we not told that "He died *for us*"—that "He gave Himself *for us*"—that "*we* have redemption through *His* blood, the forgiveness of our sins"? And does it not follow, then, that they who argue for the removal of sin, in

Digitized by Google

order to escape from the penalty of sin, are cornered in a dilemma from which there is no release—that it must be the *penalty* of our sins from which Christ, by His death, hath saved us? And that being *so* saved, we come *then only, and thereafter*, to be saved from the *dominion* of our sins?'

I reply, there is no dilemma but that which is of our own making; and it is a mistake of our own making to place *release from the penalty of sin*, antecedent to *release from the dominion of sin*. No mistake could have been more unhappy for the Church; for it constitutes the great impediment to the purification and perfection of the Church. It misapprehends the true order and sequence of events—it misapprehends the precise complexion of that real, true, and valid atonement which was made by the Lord Jesus, and which constitutes the foundation of that expiatory work which cometh through Him: it distorts the saying of the Apostle, that "the wages of sin is death," and, in point of fact, denies that such a sentiment has its application to us.

It is most true that Jesus Christ "suffered for us," and "died for us"—that He made a full, complete, and perfect atonement in the name of man, as representing man, as the Head of a new manhood; and in order that we might have the benefit of said atonement by its application to us. It is most true, moreover, that we have the application of His atonement to us by the sprinkling of His precious blood; for "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin". But what if the blood of Christ does not reach our hearts, and does not touch our persons: can it cleanse in those cases where it has had no real application?

There can be no effect without a cause. When there-

Digitized by Google

fore it is said that "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," we have the cause, and the effect stated. The simple question then is—How does the causation here mentioned operate?

What is sin, and where lies sin? Taking sin in the most general sense, we may say that sin is *disharmony with God*, and that sin when it is conceived, exists in the human heart. Sin is the soul's want of conformity to God; and it may be of various measure or degree from a simple divergence from God, to overt and positive antagonism to God. God at first set up a certain standard of moral purity in man when He put him forth from His hand; and the moment man fell from that standard, he became a sinner. Sin then lies in the soul of man as being the central ground of his personality. God Himself is perfect, and the ground of all perfection, and the standard by which all perfection is to be measured. God made all things according to a harmonious rule, and we are told He made man after His own image. If then man has deviated from that image, he is no longer in harmony with God, no longer in accord with God, he has become sin—an embodiment of sin. And this quite corresponds with the definition of sin given in the Shorter Catechism, where we are told that "sin is a want of conformity to the law of God, or a transgression of the law of God". Sin may thus of course vary in its measure; it may be but a divergence from God, or it may amount to overt antagonism to God. As God therefore has set up a certain rule of excellence in man, when He put him forth from His hand, so the moment man fell from that rule, he became a sinner. Sin then lies in the heart or soul of man, as being the central ground of his conscious per-

Digitized by Google

sonality. "Out of the heart (says our Lord) proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, blasphemies," and such like: in the heart, therefore, without doubt sin is conceived. God says, "my son, give me thine heart". If we fail to do this, if we fail to learn of God, *i.e.*, to acquire the instruction of God, and to obey that instruction, if we give ourselves to another master, such as the world or the flesh or both, then we must needs be in a state of deviation from God, and out of harmony with God; and that is sin. The heart is said not to be right in the sight of God.

It is a curious thing that we are ready to entertain the notion that our sins are abstractly written in a book. I have no assurance that there is any separate record kept of my sins, than the record which my own heart presents. But let us suppose this,—let us suppose that there is a book in which our sins are written, we are in that case naturally apt to think of the book and not of our hearts; and to imagine that if they could only be scored out of the book, all would be well. Here it is that we take up the question of sin as a debt. We regard a debt as something that may be paid independently of ourselves, being a thing purely of money, a thing merely of price; and, if we can point to a price paid, and paid in our behalf, and the payment marked in the book, we are satisfied that our case is accounted for, and that scores are wiped off. But we forget that in a case like this, *the debt is necessarily in the book of our own hearts*, and that it is not a matter simply of money, and that if the debt be not cancelled in the heart, it is not cancelled at all; and surely it cannot without absurdity be regarded as cancelled there, unless the sin be removed from that very book.

Digitized by Google

Just ask yourselves the question, what gives rise to the fact of a debt? Is it not the fact of our sin—sin in the soul? And if the fact be that the sin is in the soul, then the debt can not be regarded as otherwise than scored in the soul: the debt and the sin are one and the same thing; and therefore if remitted, this can be, only by the removal of sin from the soul. And the words employed in the Gospel of Luke in rehearsing what is called the Lord's Prayer, confirm this. It says, "forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us," which is but saying: behold, as blotted out, the sins of us who repent, as we also in like manner behold, as blotted out, the offences of those who have done us evil, and acknowledge the evil. It is a case of reconciliation. If the offence be not cherished, or be not intended, then the offended one has no charge, and bears no grudge against you. It may be that the offender refuses to give up his injurious ways against you, then you cannot forgive them, because then they cleave to him, and stand before you; and reconciliation is in consequence, rendered an impossibility. In like manner our reconciliation with God is simply impracticable, if the enmity in our hearts against his purity is not eradicated.

This is a most important consideration—a consideration that cannot be left out from the question of atonement. Why, as we all know, sin is a defilement as well as a debt; and, if we are to be prepared for a lodgment in the bosom of our Lord, must not the defilement be removed? Can God take sin into His own bosom? Can He embrace sin, so that it shall have a habitation with Him, in the sacred recesses of His holy temple? The very mention of the notion is a refutation of the

Digitized by Google

notion: it is enough to shew us emphatically what must needs be effected in our case. Truly we are "straitened in ourselves," in that we harbour sin in our souls; in which case, God cannot be gracious. God is waiting to be gracious—waiting to pour the blessed effusions of His grace into our souls for our growth in grace, for our advancement in the divine life, if we would but make room in our souls for the admittance of His holy principles. We cannot receive these holy principles, if we are carried along by other and antagonistic principles; for, in that case, we could serve two opposite masters. But how could that be, unless a man can do two opposite things at one and the same moment? In the very nature of things that is a contradiction, and cannot be. Hence it is very truly said, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God". As long, therefore, as a man is under the principles of the natural man, remission of sin is simply in his case an impossibility, because a contradiction in terms: that is, forgiveness is impossible, while the very sins to which the forgiveness applies, are bristling in all their living energy in his soul.

We are accustomed to cast stones at the Roman Catholics, because they preach the doctrine of forgiveness, through the exaction of some outward penalty, it may be the payment of a sum of money, as an atonement for sin; which payment is regarded as a means of procuring forgiveness; and assuredly the whole scheme of indulgences deserves reprobation, as a scheme of corruption—a scheme which pretends to take away sins, while it is verily a process for the retention of sins in the soul. But are we Protestants one whit better than they, if we preach forgiveness on the pretence of a

Digitized by Google

faith which is nothing more than an *assent* or *consent* to the doctrine that the death of Jesus, as such, doth relieve us from the penalty of sin? A very easy method, assuredly, of escaping from the consequences of guilt—a method which no one in his senses would despise, if he could bring his mind to believe in its reality? Here, if we would look at the matter aright, is the most delusive and deceiving of all heresies, in that a man is apt to say, "peace, peace, where there is no peace," and in circumstances where there can be no peace. "There is no peace (saith God) unto the wicked." No! the only ground of peace is the removal of the offence: then, and then only, is there remission of the sin. What! is my sin remitted, if I still remain a deceiver and a liar, a man of malice, or one given to covetousness, to raillery, and to slandering? I am atoned for if I am truly at peace with God; but can I be at peace with God, while yet my sin is persisted in, and prevails in my heart and life? It is an utter misunderstanding of the great work of atonement to entertain such an idea. But such ideas are widely entertained! How great, then, in this our day, must be the misunderstanding in respect of the great work of atonement performed for us by the Lord Jesus Christ.

What is really the nature and character of that work? Is it first of all to take away the penalty of sin? Is its meaning fundamentally to remove, not the sin, but the *effects* of sin upon the sinner? Can there be atonement while the sin is allowed to persist and to prevail in the sinner? We may rest assured from the inherent nature of law, as the unvarying instrumentality for carrying God's plans into execution, that such cannot be the case. Law is the operative procedure which

Digitized by Google

throughout the whole economy of God, carries causes into consequences; and if the causes subsist, the consequences cannot be averted; but if the causes be removed, then only will the effects be removed therewith. It must be obvious enough, therefore, that if the wages of sin be death, then the sin must be taken away, if we are to escape the wages which sin begets. It is simply nonsense to speak of atonement for sin, unless there be the removal of it. It is the removal of the sin which constitutes the very basis of atonement for sin. If I am a drunkard, or a swearer, or a deceiver, or a proud and pompous man, overbearing to others, or a covetous man, thinking that worldly gain is the chief end of my being, then I am without atonement in respect of these offences, even because I am without reconciliation; for God cannot be reconciled unto sin.

What, then, hath Christ done for us? We are told that "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin"—that "we have redemption (that is, deliverance from sin) through the blood of Christ"—that we are "washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb," which means (if it means anything) a subjective cleansing of the soul. This is obviously strong and pertinent language, and must have a direct and pertinent meaning. Here, however, as in many other things, we are apt to mistake, and we do very often mistake, the true and consistent meaning: we misinterpret what is really meant by "the blood of Christ". Though living in a purely spiritual dispensation — a dispensation which regards the Spirit as the purifying agent—we are still carried away by material things. We think of the blood of Christ, as simply and exclusively the blood of His body, the blood that was shed upon the cross—

Digitized by Google

what, indeed, the Apostle calls "the blood of the cross". When we think of Christ shedding His blood, it seems as if we could not part with the carnal dispensation of Moses—as if we could embrace no other meaning than the out-pouring of the blood of Christ's carnal body—that blood which formed the life of His earthly body, that blood which He received from His mother, and which constitutes the basis of earthly life, and the shedding of which closed the Mosaic dispensation, and the loss of which infers the death of that wherein sin lies, as the source of human transgression. And here it is that under the ruling of this thought—the thought of material blood as a cleansing element in the Christian Church—we are carried into the most illogical extravagances, and what I must with all respect term most unscriptural conclusions.

First of all, we are to bear in mind that, under the law, as the typical representation of things under christianity, it was *the sprinkling* of the blood of the victim that constituted the crowning act of atonement: *second*, we have to observe that, if "the blood of the cross" constitutes our individual atonement, then where is it? It cannot be found! It nowhere exists. It is poured out and lost for ever; and if it were needed for being sprinkled upon us, it cannot be obtained. You and I have never seen it, and we shall never see it: it has never been sprinkled upon us, and in the nature of things never can be. Whence, then, in that case, can we obtain the blood of sprinkling? But in the *third* place, think for a moment: What would it profit you, even if you could obtain it? The blood of the flesh is but another word for the flesh itself: for it is the life of the body: the body is nourished by it, is warmed by it,

Digitized by Google

is invigorated by it: it is the element by which the flesh is fed—out of which it is maintained and strengthened. But did Christ come to feed and to nourish the flesh? Assuredly not, the very reverse. Yea, He Himself says (and it is a saying that ought to convince us of the strange labyrinth of error in which, through the misconception of the meaning of "the blood of Christ," we are involved) "the flesh profiteth nothing" (nothing for the good of the soul):—"the words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life". And yet farther, in the *fourth* place, we ought to see our mistake, when we consider who and what Christ really is. True it is, that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us"; but shall we say that Christ was simply and exclusively flesh? Man, as a rule, is born "flesh," when he is born the mere creature of carnal appetites and passions; for his life, in that case, is the life of the flesh, and his soul is clothed with those principles which savour of the flesh, and thus the man is properly termed "carnal"; and as carnal, without the Spirit. But is this the picture that characterized the Lord Jesus Christ? Quite otherwise. In His personality was the flesh indeed, and without doubt the influences of the flesh were brought to bear upon Him, otherwise He could not be said to have been "tempted in all points like as we are"; but, in that personality, and as part of that personality, He had the Eternal Spirit operating in His soul, and bearing sway in His soul, and maintaining His soul in perfect harmony with God. Christ then had without doubt a higher life than the life of the flesh, a life which emphatically, yea pre-eminently, constituted *the* life of Christ; for it was through "the Eternal Spirit" that His soul was enrobed,

Digitized by Google

with the higher life, whereby, the life of the flesh was expunged therefrom, so that it should not subsist, as an irritating element, ever seeking dominion in the soul. It behoved, therefore, the lower life, the life of the flesh to be poured out; and this was done when the blood of the flesh was poured out, so that said blood should no longer exist. This was a necessity in order to put away the very roots of sin.

Are we, therefore, with an inconsistency marvellous in its very complexion, to say that the blood of the cross was truly and intrinsically the "precious blood of Christ," or that the blood which had to be sacrificed, was in any proper sense the blood which comes to be sprinkled on us? Instead of being the blood of Christ, *i.e.*, the blood which peculiarly belonged to Christ, it was rather the blood that had to be taken away from Christ, as being the blood of our flesh. We are taught that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven," it behoved Christ, therefore, to put aside flesh and blood, that is to sacrifice the same. Why? Because the flesh and blood which He took by His incarnation, that is *our* flesh and blood, was not properly nor essentially the flesh and blood of the glorified Christ. We monstrously mistake and misname the blood of Christ, if we suppose the blood of the body of *our* flesh to be *His own* precious blood. We, in that case, proclaim Christ to be mere man, it may be unconsciously, it may unintentionally; but I repeat in that case we do so not the less certainly.

I am here to proclaim that the precious blood of Christ is the precious life of Christ—the life that must be preserved, the life of the Spirit of Christ, the life that has been poured out from on high for the purifica-

Digitized by Google

tion of our natures, for the washing away of our sins, and for the presentation of our souls as blameless before the throne of God. It is that blood which is properly termed "the blood of God," that is the *life of His own essential being*, which cannot cohabit with evil, which resisteth and overthroweth evil,—the life which, when appropriated by us, makes us partakers of the Divine nature and which alone restoreth man to harmony with God. It is the Spirit of life; and, as the blood of Christ is said to cleanse from all sin, so "the law of the Spirt of life in Christ Jesus frees (or delivers) us from the law of sin and of death".

Now let it be noted that we have this precious blood in full measure and abundance; and it is the only blood of Christ of which the church of Christ has the possession. It is the great gift of Christ to His church—the gift which constitutes Him the Saviour of His church,—the gift in virtue of which we have salvation for the church—the gift through which we are enabled to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling," and without which we can have no application of the redemption purchased by Christ.

When did Christ become the Saviour of men? Was it simply when "the Word was made flesh"? Was it when He was born of a woman, and made under the law? Not so! For when so made, He had a great work to do: He had to submit to the demands of the law, as One "made sin"; and the law therefore bore on Him with all its rigour and severity: that is, the law of the Divine Spirit, as the law of divine requirement for man, which was not only objectively revealed in the ten words of the decalogue, but which he subjectively possessed in the enjoyment of the Divine nature

Digitized by Google

without measure, bore down upon the dominating power of the flesh, and crucified it as the power that sought dominion over the soul. Or was it when Christ was baptized for the public ministry, which it behoved Him to carry on, that Christ became the Saviour? Not so, for then He had to encounter the great field of trial, to which He had to be bitterly exposed, that it might be seen, how, in an engagement with the hosts of evil, Christ overcame. Was it then when Christ could say, and did say, to His Father, "I have finished the work which thou gavest Me to do; and now, O Father, glorify thou me"? Not quite even then, did Christ actually become the Saviour. I grant this indeed, that he *then* became equipped for being the Saviour; but, still there was yet a great work for him to do, in that the final and most galling contest with evil, and with the evil one, had to be encountered and borne. Christ indeed had already proved the ascendency of the Divine Spirit in His soul, in all that pertained to the world and the flesh; but the devil had one last arrow in his quiver, the consignment of Christ as a prisoner to the powers that be, in order that by a course of cruel torture, ending in the infliction of a merciless and agonizing death of slow and excruciating anguish, every possible terror might be applied to him. It might be that Christ would refuse this trial on the ground of its terribleness to the body of the flesh; in which case Satan would obtain some plea, that Christ had saved Himself from this ordeal, for the sake of the body of the flesh; and the wicked one would thus come off with the plea, that Christ after all had declined to offer up the body of the flesh, a sacrifice, under the jurisdiction of the laws of the land. True it is, that Christ

Digitized by Google

prayed to the Father to be exempted from this heartless torment; but in the contest with Satan the Father would not interpose, and Christ had the courage to give up His body to this last and final infliction—the worst to which He could be subjected; and then the sacrifice was consummated. The Spirit of Christ triumphed over the flesh, under all the exactions of the most diabolical artifices of the wicked one; and that Spirit had been the life of Christ throughout, and was now the life of Christ in His dying hour—the life which pervaded His soul as He hung patiently, while quivering upon the cross—the life which made Him bear without murmuring the lingering pangs which environed the sad six hours, during which He waited, and wished for death to terminate His sufferings—the wish, which being so long unanswered, made him appeal to the Father at the last, by the agonized outburst, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me"—an outburst attesting the deep-felt sentiment, that surely enough to satisfy even Satan was proclaimed, that He did not refuse to die. And die He did, and was relieved; for He bowed His head at the last, and gave up the Ghost.

Here, then, was the consummation and triumph of that spiritual energy, which was the living power whereby Christ was pervaded; and this energy, and this energy alone, as the power of God over the inferior nature, constituted the exclusive life-energy of Christ as the Son of God. It had only now to be shewn to the world, that, when the blood of the body had become stagnant by death, and neither the flesh nor its blood had any longer a vestige of power, whether this living soul of Christ would re-assume its sovereignty, and become enthroned in the body as now revived at the

Digitized by Google

resurrection by its potential flow of spiritual life. This we know was realized by the resurrection; and then came the ascension from earth, where so splendid a victory had been gained over all that it contained—over the three great enemies of redemption, and an entrance into heaven with the body indeed, but not that which was earthy, or that which was born of the earth, and brought up on the earth, and nourished by the earth; for the body that ascended had nothing of the earth earthy, but was become spiritual; and, therefore, the sole exclusive blood that animated that body, was the spiritual life which constituted the animating power by which He was characterized, and would be for ever characterized—the animating power by which He must for ever be glorified. Christ was now to all intents the Saviour, and in token and testimony of His Saviourship, He had but to transmit to that earth which He had left, the spiritual virtue by means of which He had Himself been enabled to overcome, and that spiritual virtue was essentially "His own blood"—that blood which alone constitutes the life of His Church upon the earth. It is by this blood as transmitted through the Holy Ghost, that Christ has become a Saviour; and this blood is truly the blood of atonement—the blood of sprinkling—the blood in which alone we are washed before God, because it is the blood that cleanseth from all sin.

I have already said not a little on the all-important theme, "the blood of Christ". This particular point is so momentous in the economy of the christian dispensation, that I must be excused dwelling on it somewhat further in this place.

First of all, let me call attention to the teaching of the Old Testament as regards the blood of atonement.

Digitized by Google

The most solemn and also the most expressive of all Mosaic ordinances, and which gave significance to all the rest, was that prescribed for what was termed "the Day of Atonement". On that day, while the people were called on to mourn over their iniquities, and to afflict their souls because of their sins, the high priest, and he alone, in his most holy robes of pure white, entered into the Holy of Holies, that there he should make atonement by blood-sprinkling, and the burning of incense. The high priest also was required to purify his own person, by bathing before assuming his white vestments. The victims, a young bullock and a ram, were to be slain, and offered without the vail, *i.e.*, outside the Holy of Holies; and their blood was to be *sprinkled* during the burning of the incense, within the vail—*sprinkled* on the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat, in behalf of the people. One remarkable part of this ceremonial, was also that of the "scape-goat," which was to follow this act of reconciliation. One goat having been chosen "for Jehovah," and offered up, and its blood sprinkled for purification, the other chosen "for Azazel" (that is, for *sending away absolutely*), the high priest confessed over it the sins of the people, and sent it away under the charge of a trustworthy person into "a land not inhabited". Hereby it was pictured that the people who took part in this ceremonial, by mourning over their sins, had their sins not only slain by the death of the victim, but carried away into the wide wilderness, where they were no more seen, and no more any visitation on account of them. All this was the symbolical teaching of the Old Testament.

I now inquire, What are we taught about the blood of Christ? First of all, we are made to look upon

Digitized by Google

Christ as one of ourselves. It is revealed that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us"; and by these words it is further explained, that "He Who was in the beginning with God," and, therefore, *unlimited*, was the all-pervading Creator of all worlds and of all creatures therein; and that "the form of God" in Him should be made subject to *limitation* in a human personality. "He Who was in the form of God, did not regard the seizure as to an equality with God, but emptied Himself, by being made in the likeness of man." We are thus introduced by the Apostle to a view of the person of Christ. We behold Him Who possessed "the form of God" in the non-limitation of infinity, by the act of incarnation set forth with "the form of God" under the limitation of man. Thus we have a second Adam constituted upon the very basis of the first Adam; but with a fullness of prerogative which the first Adam did not possess. The second Adam is emphatically called "the Branch"—*the Branch*, on the one hand, as a part of the first Adam, and the Branch, on the other hand, as a part of God—having within himself the root of Godhead, and the root of manhood, two distinct natures, that he might bring both into one, in cordial harmony the one with the other.

We are expressly told that His great work was to create in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace (Ephesians ii., 15, 16); and this, by slaying the enmity in His flesh. Here we see the necessity of death, the death of the flesh, as declared here to be hostile to the law of God, in order to the perfect freedom of a quickened life in and through the Spirit. We see Christ in the outer man "made sin," while in the inner man He was altogether righteous. He was made sin,

Digitized by Google

by the very fact that He was made flesh, even our flesh. He was made sin, in that He was tempted like as we are, not only by the devil and by the world, but also by the flesh, and through the medium of the flesh. He was made sin in order to the exercise of priesthood, for it behoved Him to have somewhat to offer as a sacrifice to God: He was made sin, that through the cross He might "put away sin". Yet, as I have said, He was "without sin". He was without sin, in that there was no guile in His heart and no guilt in His life. He was without sin, in that His essential internal self, was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners". He was without sin, in that "He pleased God in all things". He was without sin, in that "the prince of this world came, and could plant nothing in Christ". He was without sin, in that He is declared to have stood as a "lamb, without blemish and without spot," before God.

It behoves us to apprehend how these two contradictory relations had their application to Him by His incarnation. We are told that "Him Who knew no sin, God *made to be sin* in our behalf". He was made sin with a view to our case, *i.e.*, to reach and lay hold of our case, *i.e.*, with a view to lay a foundation for humanity's extrication as "sold under sin". He was made sin, that He by Himself purging it, and thereby pressing its entire removal, might apply the process to us: He was made sin, in that He was assaulted by sin, not only from the evil one, through instigations which have their seat in the body, and not only from the world through inducements which also come through the body, but directly from the body itself, in that the body (as *our* body) of necessity had emotions as charac-

Digitized by Google

terizing it, which would throw their impulses on the soul. But notwithstanding these characteristics which pertained to the outer man, we cannot be too particular in holding that the inner man was essentially "without sin"—without sin, in that His soul was always antagonistic to sin—without sin, in that the temptations to sin, which He experienced in all respects like ourselves, had no power over Him for a moment—without sin, in that the body of the flesh, in respect of those desires which would lead unto sin, was being itself spiritually put to death, and, consequently, the very seat of human sin destroyed, as it was ultimately physically crucified; and so Satan became hereby discomfited, in that the seeds which He had implanted in the human frame were by Christ utterly rooted out.

In this way, then, the department of sin, which had thus been contaminated by the devil, came to be thoroughly cleansed from sin by Jesus Christ, who brought in thereupon an everlasting righteousness as the motive power of the soul's operation—an operation of which the body must become a partaker, as a willing instrument of the righteous soul's behests; and thereby a complete recovery of the whole man to God be manifested. Thus was Christ "made perfect," as having instituted and established that new manhood, out of which our own new creatureship is evolved. Christ, having achieved this great work which He came into the world to fulfil, became by this achievement the Author of eternal salvation to all who allied themselves to His line of action.

The one point to be noted in Christ's *officiation to God*, is this:—How did Christ thus accomplish the work given Him to do? How did He by Himself

Digitized by Google

purge away our sin as laid upon Him? The answer, the one answer is, *by death*—by death to the body of sin. And how was death manifested? The answer, the one answer is, by pouring out the blood of the body of sin. Christ had, in point of fact, slain the body of sin, in respect of the emotions of the flesh, before the final sacrifice of the body on the tree, but that final sacrifice was endured that He might shew that the blood of enmity was poured out, and enmity thereby for ever rooted out. What then? Was Christ no longer in life? Why, He now retained exclusively His own spiritual life in full and unrestricted freedom, and thereby He displayed a full and complete redemption. He was now enabled to take up an effective *officiation to man.* Having died for our sin, He rose for our justification: *i.e.*, He rose to apply the spirit-nature, that now exclusively belonged to Him, to us men for our regeneration; *i.e.*, to sprinkle His own precious blood, the blood of that holy spirit-nature, on us that we may be cleansed thereby from sin, and established in righteousness.

We ought to see, then, in what way our sins are removed from us. The Apostle John says, "the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin". The Apostle Paul corroborates John, by saying, "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins," literally, *the taking away* of sins (ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτομάτων). We are expressly taught that the ἄφεσις, or deliverance from sin, takes place and is obtained διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτου, that is, *by means of, through the intervention of, by the application of, His blood.* Can we now be in doubt as to what the cleansing blood of Christ really is?

Digitized by Google

I ask, *first*: Can we regard it as the blood of His body—the blood that was poured out upon the altar—the blood that was simply the life of the body? As to His body, He was born of His mother, and was "of the seed of David". The blood of His mother, therefore, was the blood of Christ's body. He was thereby "made of a woman," and as such "under the law," *i.e.*, subject to the operation of the law which characterizes humanity, and, therefore, subject to the challenge of the law which God has prescribed for humanity. How could the blood of Christ's body cleanse our souls? that is, How could the blood of Mary cleanse our souls? How could any human blood—blood that pertains to the body, cleanse our souls? The blood of the body is something essentially material—something that can be seen by the eye and otherwise recognized by outward sense—something red in colour, warm to the touch as pervading the living frame, liquid as it flows in the veins, but congealed under the stoppage of cold death: such blood that is thus adapted for the bodily frame, and that constitutes the life of the bodily frame, is not fitted to become the life of the soul: it is not at all applicable to the case of souls. Souls must have the application of spiritual things; and the present is emphatically a spiritual dispensation ministering spiritual things to the souls of men. It cannot, therefore, be the blood of Christ's body that is sprinkled upon us, in order to our atonement, in order to our reconciliation with God. I would as soon believe in transubstantiation as in the efficacy of bodily blood, or in the dogma that bodily blood is no longer what it is.

But we are not required, for many reasons, to believe that the blood of Christ's body cleanses our souls. It

Digitized by Google

cannot be. It would be asking us to believe in an impossibility—to believe what, moreover, Christ expressly forbids us to believe, when He says that the blood of the body profiteth nothing—to believe what the Word of God condemns, for it tells us we are born, not of creature-blood, nor of the blood of man. The bodily blood is the nourishing element of the flesh, the stuff out of which the flesh is maintained, and is, therefore, in one and the same category with the flesh itself. And in the case of Christ, this blood, as I have said, was sacrificed and yielded up to be carried away. And in being thus sacrificed and taken out of the way, the sacrifice was "the source of a sweet smell unto God".

But was there not a blood of Christ remaining behind—a blood of Christ carried by Him into the Holy of Holies—a blood purified from all admixture of mere human blood—a blood set before God in the sacred precincts of His peculiar dwelling-place, and before angels—a blood to be sprinkled for the purposes of sanctification—a holy blood, the blood of spiritual life—the blood which properly belongs to a spiritual dispensation—"the blood of the New Testament," as contrasted with the blood of the Old Testament—that which by distinction is emphatically termed "His own blood," "the precious blood of Christ".

Contemplate, then, this blood, "the blood of the new covenant," the blood of a spiritual dispensation, that is, blood which gives spiritual life—the life-blood of immortality: contemplate the animating principle of that dispensation under which we have the privilege to exist—"the blood of the *everlasting* covenant" in contrast with the blood of a *temporary* covenant of carnal things—the blood which "brought again from the dead

Digitized by Google

the Lord Jesus," whereby He showed Himself alive by many infallible proofs, as holding the life of immortality. We have this spirit-blood bequeathed to us by Christ. Sprinkled forth in heaven, it descends to earth. The Spirit of God hath taken it, as the essential life of Christ, and hath conveyed the same to us. It is contained in the Divine Word: it operates as the poison of sin, on the one hand, and as the life of righteousness on the other: it is the application to us of the atonement of Christ: it involves in its application our regeneration: it plants in our souls the seed of the resurrection-body in and through the decay of the outward man. The precious blood of Christ, then, is the precious life of Christ that is conserved to us by the Gospel, that has been poured out from on high, for the purification of our souls, for the washing away of our sins, and for the presentation of our souls as blameless before the throne of God. As "the blood of God," which is the life of God, was in Jesus Christ, and constituted the life of Jesus Christ as "quickened in the Spirit"; so it follows, that it is the blood of God which is vouchsafed to His Church from Christ, to spiritualize it with new life, even the life of His own pure and perfected nature, that we may thereby be restored to harmony with God. This blood gives the law of the spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, and "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus (when applied to us) frees us from the law of sin and of death".

How obvious, then, does "the remission of sins" follow from the blood of Christ, as thus understood. If it be true that the material of this spirit-blood is in the Holy Scriptures, I have, as a minister of Christ, the great privilege of sprinkling that blood upon you, and,

Digitized by Google

consequently, the privilege of giving unto you that which purifies and enriches the soul—which goes to ennoble and elevate the soul, above the world—which goes to save the soul for heaven. If the precious blood of Christ is neither more nor less than "the grace of God, that bringeth salvation"—if it is contained in "the Gospel which is able to save the soul"; if through this precious gift we are enabled to "purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God"; if the due reception of this blood as the source of our new life has the effect of killing the old man and of reviving in us the new man, and so of enabling us to "work out our salvation"; if thereby we become partakers of Christ Jesus and His righteousness; then we have "the blood of the covenant whereby we are sanctified," "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than the blood of Abel," for it is emphatically the blood of redemption, the blood whereby we are delivered from sin, the blood whereby we are nourished with life and are made meet to be partakers of the heavenly glory.

Now, it is of importance to see by what process that change is effected in us which involves the remission of our sins. We are taught that there are emphatically *two* "saving graces," and only two, which must be in exercise in order to the obtaining of salvation, *viz.*, Repentance and Faith—not repentance only, nor faith only, but repentance and faith—"repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ"; and these are properly termed "saving graces," because they are essential (both essential) to secure salvation. By repentance we sacrifice the old man, the man of sin: by faith we acquire the new man, the man of righteousness. The former (*i.e.*, the old man) is by repentance broken

Digitized by Google

down, the latter (*i.e.*, the new man) is by faith built up, in the soul. In this way, a renovation takes place: the soul comes to be recovered unto God: regeneration is effected. The soul must first be emptied of its sinful principles and tendencies; and this takes place through the exercise of repentance: then only is the soul capable of faith, *i.e.*, of receiving the righteousness of Christ, which constitutes the material of spiritual life, and makes the soul in point of fact a new creature. In the former case, there is what is technically called *the forgiveness of sins;* in the latter case, there is what is called *the adoption of our persons* as the subjects of heaven.

There is not unfrequently a reluctance to admit the privilege here contended for to repentance, lest it should be thought that the pardon of sin is begotten by any work of our own; but it is here forgotten, that "the repentance that needeth not to be repented of" is not a work of our own, but is emphatically the work of God, who worketh in us—a work brought about by the application of "the terrors of the Lord," as the Apostle says, "by the terrors of the Lord we persuade men". But what are these terrors in a spiritual dispensation? They are the application of the cross: they are the crucifying of the members of Christ: they are the blood of Christ, so far as respects the treatment due to the body of sin; and this, in order to the immolation of sin; and this preparatory to the application of Christ sanctified: they are the revealment of Christ's righteousness: they are the blood of Christ, so far as respects the building up of the new life.

Now, letting alone all questions as to human authorities in matters of pure theology under which men and

Digitized by Google

churches are apt to rank themselves, such as Arminianism or Calvinism, I ask: *Is this scripturalism?* We may feel ourselves much bound by human creeds; and blessed be God, the creed of the truly Protestant Church is a mighty advance for good upon the human annexations of Rome; but if anyone says that the creeds of Protestantism have reached the *ne plus ultra* of perfection—if anyone says that scripturalism, in its completest interpretation, can go no further than the *Confession of Faith* or *39 Articles* have reached—if anyone says that these are full and perfect, and equivalent to Scripture itself, I must dissent against being so cornered up and restricted in regard to the Word of God. This would be nothing less than cruelty as well as gross inconsistency, on the part of Protestantism. We may not place any creed, however honestly drawn up by intelligent men, on a line and in a level with the Scriptures, much less as a substitute for the Scriptures, or of equal authority with the Scriptures, or in any way shunt the Scriptures to a side, that the creed may prevail. On the contrary, the creed of the Church must ever be secondary to the Scriptures, because it depends on, and professes to have its authority from the Scriptures. Apart from the Scriptures, a church-creed has properly no standing. The Scriptures are a *fixity* having the direct authority of God: the creed of the Church is not a fixity; but is only *man's attainment* in the knowledge of the Scriptures, at a certain date—a thing, therefore, susceptible of modification, according as we make progress in the fresher and fuller interpretation of the Scriptures. I believe in the Scriptures first and foremost, and I believe in them according to the most natural interpretation of them, an interpre-

Digitized by Google

tation which secures harmony in all its parts, an interpretation which the Church herself demands, *viz.*, that Scripture shall be in consistency with Scripture, and with all fully ascertained knowledge. Yet we must have creeds. They are the representations of the churches' attainment in divine things, and they bind the members of the Church in harmony together into a unity for the propagation of the principles to which she has attained. There can be properly no Church without a creed; but it would be an outrage upon reason, and an obstruction to all sound advancement, to suspend the Scriptures upon the creed, instead of suspending the creed upon the Scriptures.

What I have to say, therefore, as to the true doctrine of "the remission of sins," is this, that, *unlike to that of Arminianism*, it lays no account on anything as good in the natural man, as if he natively had in him "a grace of congruity" which can meet God half-way; and *unlike that of Calvinism*, which, though holding the doctrine of election, yes! and of reprobation, too, repudiates anything like favouritism or caprice on the part of God—a creed, therefore, which, taking God's own word, on God's own authority, interprets that word on principles which should commend themselves to our common understanding and reason—principles which consist with all that we know of God—principles which bear the application of cause and effect as He has instituted these in the world—principles, therefore, which are essentially scientific in as far as there is the assignment of an adequate cause to the production of a special effect—principles honouring to God, as the primary Cause of all, and the impartial Arbiter of all,

Digitized by Google

while giving entire freedom to man as the creature operated upon by God.

Surely the churches will come to see in what atonement really consists, and how remission of sins is practically effected. It might be thought that the Church of Scotland has fairly seen through this difficulty, when she puts forth the question: "How are we made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ?" She has not replied by pointing to *substitution*, but by referring to the "*application* of it to us, by the Holy Spirit working faith in us and thereby uniting us to Christ (*i.e.*, *identifying* us with Christ) in our effectual calling". This effectual calling, which really means our regeneration, brings with it our justification, adoption, and sanctification. Here, assuredly, according to every logical conclusion, the doctrine of substitution is excluded, and *conformity to the gracious type* made to embrace all. As the first Adam lost the grand prerogative of the divine Spirit, and had, therefore, the carnal part ruling in wild and wayward sway in the soul. So the second Adam, coming in the flesh, brought down the flesh from its usurped ascendency in the soul, and offered up the flesh a sacrifice at the shrine of the Everlasting Spirit, and thus putting away sin in its deepest, inmost germ, and He had His soul plenished with the grace of the Spirit. And "having been made perfect," He acquired the prerogative through His covenant with the Father, to apply that very process of cure for the generations of men. Christ was thus "the foundation"; and so soon as we come to see how sin was removed from the foundation, so soon do we apprehend the process whereby sin is removed from every stone of the sacred edifice. The new manhood

Digitized by Google

begotten by Christ in His own person had no vestige of sin: the new manhood begotten by Christ in the persons of His disciples have their sins in like manner ultimately removed; and the removal of sin is tantamount to the forgiveness of sins. There is no avengement of God for sins that have been taken away. In God's dispensation, the expurgation of sin is the discharge of the penalty of sin. If, then, the expurgation of sin, and the discharge from the penalty of sin, can be attested by principles in perfect harmony with reason when elevated to full intelligence, and with Scripture in its most natural and harmonious interpretation, we have complete assurance, and entire satisfaction, that the Holy Scriptures, and the grand scheme of Salvation, which they propound, are from God.

Let us look to our foundations. The fact stands that *the second Adam exactly met the case of the first Adam;* and as the first Adam lost the grand prerogative of the divine Spirit, and thereby left the carnal part or lower nature to rule in wild and wayward sway in the soul, so the second Adam, coming in the flesh, brought down the flesh from its usurped ascendency in the soul, and offered up the flesh a sacrifice at the shrine of the Spirit, and put away sin in its inmost germ. And having been made perfect, He acquired the prerogative, through compact or covenant with the Father, to apply *the same process of cure* for the generations of men. Christ is made the "foundation"; and so soon as we understand how this foundation was laid, so soon shall we observe the process by which sins are forgiven, and a new manhood is begotten, to the glory of God and the salvation of men.

A few words about fore-ordination to faith. It is

Digitized by Google

said, "as many as were *ordained* to eternal life believed". But how came certain ones to be ordained to eternal life? and how came they to believe, because they were ordained to eternal life? Whence have these the saving graces of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ? Are these impertinent questions? Observe under what circumstances the call of God is given. The whole matter, I at once admit, begins with God and continues with God: man could do nothing for himself, as a purely carnal being, not having the Spirit. How comes man, then, to obtain the Spirit, that Spirit which brings the life of God into the soul of man? There are two calls on the part of God, the one *general*, the other *particular*. By the general call "He commands *all* men everywhere to repent". Here, there is no ordination, or rather fore-ordination: all the world as such is guilty before God; and God tells them generally of their sin, and thereby tells them generally of their danger, and calls on them to turn therefrom. He brings the law of terrors to bear upon men whereever His word extends; and He excludes none where it extends—not one whatever from the declaration, that he is by nature in a state of condemnation, and subject to the wrath of God. Is it to be said that this denouncement from heaven can have no effect upon any? Is it to be said that the law of terrors can have no alarming efficacy upon any of the children of men. God knows otherwise: God does not devise a plan which shall be absolutely in vain? True it is, that God does not force any to give up their sins—does not compel any to repent and turn from their wickedness; but He puts sufficient motives into the souls of men, and we all know that without such interposition on the

Digitized by Google

part of God, none would or could be arrested in the midst of their sin; and we know further, from the very constitution of the human mind, that men who desire life and happiness as their greatest good, and flee from the approach of evil made known to them, are amenable to change. And if they change, the change, therefore, is and must be attributable to Him Who caused it. This change is the beginning of good things in the case of him who undergoes it. That many do undergo it is a fact which cannot be disputed. It is a change which we behold every day, as effected under the divine economy. And as to the nature of this change, we need hardly say it is expressed by the Apostle when he represents a man as crying out: "Oh! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" *i.e.*, this body of sin, involving me in death. Does not God know that this general call will alight effectively on some? He knows it full well! What then? Why, there is but one other step, and it is this, that God looks on the objects thus arrested, thus convinced of their sin, and therefore convinced of their danger, and therefore repentant by the touch of Christ's blood; and He chooses to call them effectively, and to adopt them particularly, into His family, that these may have all the privileges of the sons of God. And what is this but the election or, if you please, selection of such persons to exercise faith, and through this to partake of the good things of His house, and so become heirs of the grace of life, and be not only gifted with the tokens of salvation, but prepared thereby for the kingdom of life?

There are two things to be achieved in the regeneration of man: first, *the banishment or expulsion of sin;*

Digitized by Google

and second, *the impartation or impulsion of righteousness;* and He, Who fundamentally is "no Respecter of persons," is yet brought, through this very scheme of impartiality, to select those who shall be heirs of the grace of life. It is not enough that there be the remission of sins, there must be also a replenishment of holy principles, whereby the man becomes a new creature: "Old things are passed away; behold all things are become new".

And man for himself has no proper share in the glory of such achievement. True it is, that man is not an automaton in this matter, and true it is, that it may seem a difficult matter to settle the marches of the divine and human operation in this wonderful process: yet the case can be made sufficiently clear, as a case in which human freedom is kept sacred as the fundamental prerogative of man in the eyes of God. God simply lays His good things at our feet, adducing at the same time those *motives* whereby we should be influenced to receive them. If I warn a blind man of the danger that confronts him in his path, I do not compel him to desist going forward, but I give him sufficient motive to desist; and if he does at my bidding desist, surely he is indebted to me for saving him from the ditch into which he would have otherwise fallen. And if I point out to him the safe way whereby he will reach his home, and if he follows my directions, surely he is indebted to me for the attainment of it. In all this the blind man is perfectly free; and yet we see under what circumstances the interposition of another arrests his course and puts him on the true direction, which otherwise he would have missed. Let us see in our case, as under the teaching and training of God, what we are indebted

Digitized by Google

for to God. We are indebted to God for preparing a home for us in the dynasty yet to be revealed: we are indebted to God for manifesting Himself to us in the only way in which we could see the ground and origin of sin, and also the ground and origin of grace, and that is by manifesting Himself in and through the flesh. When we understand how Jesus Christ sacrificed the body of the flesh, as being the body of sin, so that it should have no dominion whatever in the soul, but that the Spirit in Him should alone bear sway, we are reminded that to us is vouchsafed, not only the marvellous gift of the Spirit as in Christ Jesus; but with this we have the highest inducing motive to apply the gift for the expulsion of sin, on the one hand, and for the acquisition of righteousness, on the other. Thus it is that "Jesus saves us from our sins": not directly from the punishment of our sins, but first from our sins, that we may be saved from the punishment of them; for the escape from punishment follows when sin is put away, in as far as *there is no penalty where there is no sin;* and we are expressly told that "He gave Himself for us, *that* He might redeem us (not from the effects of iniquity, but from iniquity itself), and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works".

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS I.

ON THE DIVINE DECREES.

Confession of Faith: Chapter III., Of God's Eternal Decree.

Thirty-nine Articles: Article XVII., Of Predestination and Election.

Articles of the Church of Ireland: Chapter III., Of God's Eternal Decree and Predestination.

Judgment of the Synod of Dort: Chapter I., Concerning God's Predestination.

To draw up a creed without reference to the Decrees of God, would assuredly be regarded as a serious defect; and yet not a few of the creeds which are in existence, do touch this question with obvious hesitancy. Those which enter upon this topic with the greatest fulness are specified at the head of this article. It has been properly regarded, as heretofore understood, as a subject very liable to be misapplied. The *Westminster Confession* saith: "The doctrine of this high mystery of Predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending to the will of God revealed in His Word, and yielding obedience thereto, may from the certainty of their effectual vocation be assured of their eternal Election". Here it is directly implied that Election is the fountain of all goodness; for obedience to the Gospel is pointed to, as the criterion whereby

Digitized by Google

a man is to judge as to his Election. The 17th Article of the *Church of England* expressly declares it. "They which be endued with so excellent a benefit from God [Election], be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be freely justified: they be made sons of God through adoption: they be made like the image of His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy attain to everlasting felicity." The Articles of the *Church of Ireland*, mainly the production of Archbishop Usher, use the same words. The language of the *Synod of Dort* in like manner says (Article IX.): "Election is the fountain of all saving good, from whence faith, holiness, and the residue of saving gifts, lastly everlasting life itself, do flow".

It is obvious, hence, that these creeds indicate with no uncertainty of statement, that the election of God is to *make men believers*, and that it is not prompted because of any good foreseen in the condition of the natural man. A question not unnatural is hereupon prompted in the reflective mind: 'Are we then helplessly thrown back upon the sovereign good pleasure of God, as antecedently determining, fixing, and settling our state on earth without the possibility of any explanation?' It is obvious the framers of our creeds thought so. There is, however, a *crux* here; and it lies in the question: If all mankind by reason of the fall are born utterly helpless of themselves to please God: upon what principle can it be supposed that God acts, in choosing some and passing by others? The *Westminster Confession* says: "God was pleased according to

Digitized by Google

the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by the rest of mankind [*i.e.*, those not elected], and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice". The *Synod of Dort* is equally strong on this point. But after all, it is impossible to repress the thought, that God has and must have a clear and consistent principle, as the grounds on which He extends or withholdeth mercy, while also the thought comes up—If justice could be satisfied by the election of some, why might it not be satisfied by the election of many? The perplexity here raised in many a bosom is, whether such an off-hand declaration gives a correct representation of the character of God, as on the one hand, "no Respecter of persons," and on the other hand, as "merciful and gracious" to all alike in His dealings with *all*.

The problem therefore to be solved is this: not to question the fact of the Divine sovereignty, for that abides from everlasting; but rather to inquire whether principles, as belonging to God, are not open to us, which go to explain to us *the laws on which the Divine sovereignty itself is exercised.* It is said, and with truth, that the principle on which Calvin rested the exercise of the Divine Decrees, was the absolute sovereignty of God. But Calvin should have advanced a step beyond this, and have inquired whether the sovereignty of God must not always be regulated by righteousness and impartiality—an impartiality which holds the scales of justice with an even hand. Calvin thought that reverence demanded that we must not attempt to go beyond the idea of bare sovereignty, and that the counsel

Digitized by Google

of God must here be "unsearchable". We again come to feel that there is something more profound in the character of God than mere sovereignty—something dearer to God than mere sovereignty—something on which the very operations of sovereignty are themselves dependent; and reverence for the name of God, and care for the character of God, demand that we in our day should extend our inquiry somewhat more closely into the principles which we know must govern the Divine mind.

We are taught, and must believe, that whatever God does, He does in righteousness. But what is righteousness? It of necessity always embraces two things, *Knowledge* and *Love*. There can be no righteousness that does not combine these two. Knowledge is first indispensable—indispensable fundamentally, indispensable preliminarily—indispensable as the basis of all fit operation; for without it, all that is effected in the category of will, would only be blind impulse. Farther, fulness of Knowledge is absolutely essential to the Divine mind, in order to see all the alternative consequences flowing from this, that, or the other exercise of will.

But Love is equally indispensable, for without Love there could be no will. But what is Love in the Divine bosom? It is essentially *the desire of the best estate of the creature.* This desire lies at the very foundation of all sound moral law.[1] It constitutes, therefore, of necessity the guiding principle of action in the exercise of the Divine Will. We cannot be wrong, therefore, in positing in God, as the necessary preparation for all

[1] See the foundation of moral law and its operation, in *Excursus* XIII. and XVII.

Digitized by Google

true action in the works of creation and of providence, these two fundamental prerogatives: first, a *perfect intelligence* of the ground He had to operate upon—its capabilities and possibilities under all the conditions that might be imposed upon it; and second, a *perfect love* for the highest excellency of which these conditions can be made susceptible. Nothing less than these two elements of thought could suffice for the perfection of the Divine mind. "God is light," and "God is love": these two describe fundamentally the Divine character. And this is to be noted, that while *Knowledge* is the essential attribute of God as regards intelligence, *Love for the best* is the essential attribute of God as regards will: Love is the motive power out of which His will springs.

So far then I prepare the way for this approach to the lofty subject of the Divine Decrees. As to Decree, let me here remark that in the very nature of things it is a *necessity* of the Divine character. If there is anything for God to do, as a wise Intelligence He must have an end to serve, that is, *a purpose to fulfil*, in the doing of it. Purpose lies at the foundation of all God's operations; for it is herein that the operation of the highest reason has its aim. He sees what *can* be done, He sees what *ought* to be done, that is, what shall be done, that is, what is right and proper to be done, in securing the object sought for; and the righteousness which is characteristic of the *best that can be done*, as an expression of *the love of the best*, constitutes the motive power of will in carrying the same into effect. In this way the glory of God, as a God of righteousness, stands forth as the directing and controlling principle in the exercise of Divine sovereignty.

Digitized by Google

But the documents at the head of this article dread to enter upon any analysis of the Divine Will; and so long as this feeling prevails, any attempt to expound the Divine Decrees must of necessity end in failure. They modify the Decrees of God, only so far as to free God from being "the Author of sin," and from offering "violence to the will of the creatures," and from taking away "the liberty or contingency of second causes". Here, however, is interposed an enormous modification of the averment that "God hath ordained whatsoever comes to pass". Hence it is obvious that our creed-framers had by no means gained the key whereby to open up the mysteries of the Decrees of God. They readily confess to this; and leave all "in the most free pleasure of His will". The language of the *Westminster Confession* is: "Those of mankind that are predestinated to life, God, before the foundation of the world, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the *secret* counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or of good works, or of perseverance in either of them, or of any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace".

Here it is where the shoe pinches. If God was moved to make a choice; and if, as the *Synod of Dort* says, "He hath chosen in Christ unto salvation, a set number of men neither better nor more worthy than others, but lying in the common misery with others, and not upon a foresight of faith or holiness in man, but unto faith and the obedience of faith," *there must have been some ground in God for this particular movement of His will to choose.* Can this ground be discovered?

Digitized by Google

Or *is choice possible* where all are alike lying in "the common misery"? Does not the *Synod* hereby shut up God to *random* action?

It is remarkable that with the exception of the *Westminster Confession* and the Articles of the *Synod of Dort*, none of the creeds make mention of Foreknowledge and Foreordination; and none whatever refer to the precise connexion which the latter has to the former, or rather to the dependence of the latter (in the sphere of mind as an exercise of the will) on the former, as supplying *the motive power, out of which all will proceeds.* This great want no doubt is to be ascribed to an ignorance of those principles of mind which give rise to the exercise of will. At the same time, the Scriptures very markedly indicate the distinction betwixt the two states, the one pointing to *intelligence*, the other to *will.* Peter, for example, lays down the maxim that election is "according to foreknowledge" (i., 2), by which we are bound to understand, that *the exercise of will in election is conformable to the foreknowledge of what is best.* And again Paul says: "Whom God foreknew He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son". Surely if this means anything, it means, first, that there is *a close connexion betwixt foreknowledge and foreordination*, and second, that in some way *the latter was subservient to the former.* And again: "God did not cast off His people whom He foreknew". Yet, notwithstanding this obvious distinction scripturally, the creeds seem to confound them, or rather to make the foreknowledge to stand forth as based on the foreordination.[1] Hence

[1] There is, of course, a Foreknowledge based on Foreordination, *viz.*, the foreknowledge of things actually foreordained. Nothing can be

Digitized by Google

the *Westminster Confession* says: "Although God knows whatsoever can or may come to pass, upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as a future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions". There is obviously a want of clearness in this statement; for it has been generally interpreted to mean that the Decrees of God are not dependent on foreknowledge. God could of course see nothing as certainly future unless it had been decreed, or unless the foundation from which it arises had been decreed; but surely the conceptions which were in the mind of God, and which were satisfactory to Him when He weighed them, He could decree; and it was a good argument for them being decreed when He saw them to be good. We must interpret the meaning of the compilers from what we know of their dogma. Their dogma laid this foundation that "God decreed whatsoever comes to pass". Hence they repudiated the idea that possibilities, which might present themselves as things future to the knowledge of God, under conditions not established by God, could be the foreordinations of God. There they were right; but there is notwithstanding a grievous failure duly to apprehend the character of the mental process which sets forth a dependence or subordination betwixt foresight and will, while they also fail to recognize that things permitted, but not positively foreordained, may form in the foreknowledge of God, a basis on which

surer than this, that when a thing has been actually fore-determined by sovereign authority, it must in that case be seen as a thing of the future. There is also the collateral development of the things foreordained that must be foreseen by a perfect intelligence, and foreseen, too, because of the foreordination of their combinations.

Digitized by Google

God has been pleased to ordain a course of action in the world.

It is certain that what are called foreknowledge and foreordination are the exercises of a rational mind; the one lying in the category of *Intelligence* simply, and the other lying in the category of *Will.* Farther: it is equally certain that we can approach these states in the Divine mind, only through corresponding states in our own experience. Any other view, that would take up the consideration of the question upon principles of which we know nothing, is not only unnatural, but confessedly impossible of solution. Reason demands that if we are at liberty to inquire at all into the workings of God (and surely this liberty is allowed if we are to "justify the ways of God to man"), we can do so only in conformity to the workings of that rational mind, with which God has endowed us. And if Scripture teaches that "God made man after *His own image, in His own likeness*" (a saying that can have reference to mind only), it surely follows that the laws which govern human intelligence and will, as operations in a limited sphere, must in reason be regarded as analogous to those, which as operations, govern and regulate the mind and will of God in their unlimited sphere.

Coming, then, to the operations of God, let me take those of Creation. Granting the existence of an Absolute Intelligence, as lying at the foundation of all beinghood, and this in connexion with the unconscious Spirit-medium wherein His own personality lives and moves, we have simply to postulate, that said intelligence had something for its object. I speak not of the reflex of the Divine personality, whereby the Father sees Himself in the Son, but of the medium spoken of,

Digitized by Google

which may be termed the atmosphere of His own existence, and which constituted a ground, so to speak, out of which to frame an objective universe. What I say is this, that while as yet there was no creation, Divine Intelligence had an understanding of all the possibilities to which that medium could be turned; and seeing, in the conception of these, that some of them would be very gratifying to Himself, were they in full accomplishment, this constituted motive enough for the exercise of the Divine will in determining to have them realized. It is the most natural conclusion to come to, that the Divine Intelligence in surveying the possibilities of what may without inconsistency be termed objective existence, had before Him the final display of a destination of rational beings in miniature-forms "after His own likeness," enjoying the glories of immortality, and that this realization would be a source of constant satisfaction to Himself, in what may be termed the enlarged display of Himself, in the expansion of Himself in endless forms in infinity; while their communings with Himself and with one another, in the happiness of their immortal state, would multiply for Himself the sources of gratification and enjoyment: it is therefore quite within the grasp of our analysis to see, that the sight or (which is the same thing) the foresight of all this in His own mind, as something beautiful and desirable, supplies the motive-power which operates in the production of will—a motive-power to determine on the formation of creation accordingly, a creation which should lead to the actual accomplishment of all this, as a realization most glorifying to God. Here, then, we have foreknowledge supplying a motive for the exercise of foreordination.

Digitized by Google

But in the actual process of carrying it out, it is obvious enough that there must be *a series of intermediate steps* betwixt the first beginnings of creation and the ultimate phenomena to which the works of creation might be conducive. Our own intelligence knows by experience that, in projecting *an ulterior object*, as something very desirable to be attained as the fulfilment of a valuable purpose, there must meanwhile be the necessity of laying the basis of that object in a series of intermediate or *preparatory agencies*, which require to be associated and interlinked in due subordination, ere it is possible to attain the ultimate purpose. Of this, the construction of a complicated machine affords an illustration. It behoved, then, the same process of mental steps to be gone through in the devising of what was needful to the attainment of the immediate object aimed at. Hence, there come of necessity to be involved what are properly called *the intermediate works of creation*, that is, those works which go to subserve the production of the ultimate and desired object. Hence, if the end be the glorification of God Himself, by the setting up of man in an incorruptible and immortal sphere, as something peculiarly pleasing to God, and desired by God, there must needs be the creation of man. But if there must needs be the creation of man, there must needs be the creation of the earth as a habitation for man. And again, if there must needs be the creation of the earth, there must be the due plenishment of the earth as a prepared place for man. And if all this must be, there must be the preliminary preparation of the material out of which these can be framed. That is, there must first of all be the formation of atoms with their respective laws of combi-

Digitized by Google

nation, in order to the mechanism of matter, as the ground or rather fountain of terrestrial things. Farther, in order that material things might duly serve their ends for man, it was needful to fill the world with vegetable and animal life. It is not difficult, then, in this way to apprehend that, in order to the accomplishment of the grand and final purpose as the main object of the Divine desire, there behoved to be so many intermediate stages or circles of special creation, each as a basis to that which should follow, in order to the progress of the process, which leads to the main and ultimate end. What, therefore, do we find at each particular stage? We find always that foreknowledge gives rise to foreordination.

First of all, take the constitution of matter. There had to be ordained what has been termed the *a*, *b*, *c* of matter, that is, the primary elements of which matter is composed. How can this be, seeing we are carried back to an era when as yet there was no matter? We are necessarily referred to the Divine intelligence, as having a thorough knowledge of the capabilities of the unconscious spirit-medium to be wrought upon. And what motive could give rise to the volition to have these capabilities put to the test? What, but the desire to have matter created to fulfil an end. This constituted motive enough for the exercise of the Divine will to have it so. And this is an exemplification of foreknowledge begetting foreordination.

But this creation of the atoms of matter with their respective properties prescribing the laws of their combination; and the formation of matter hereby; and the constitution of matter into globes of space, set forth another fresh field of foreknowledge with its peculiar

Digitized by Google

wants in the due progress of the great conception. There being now before the mind's eye a world of matter fulfilling the laws of its own being, there thus lies before the Divine intelligence a broad platform on which to erect a vast series of objects, rising in the scale of complexity, from the simplest structure to the most intricate mechanism, terminating in the creature man. All these objects, as filling up the Divine conception of what was needful for the world, and therefore very good as objects, had each its own particular department: hence the great motive for their foreordination.

We can gather, therefore, the order of Divine determinations, as each separate case came before Him; and all of them in due succession, and appropriate position, corresponding to the necessity or propriety of their existence, till last of all the crowning work of creation was reached, *viz.*, man himself, as the outcome of the great process of devising what is best. Now, what is all this, but fresh illustration of the great truth, that from the platform of intelligence looking upon the things designed as objects to be desired, the determination sprang to have the same brought into being as objects of reality. It is said that when creation stood forth in conformity to the great design in His mind, God pronounced all to be "very good". What is this but saying that the realization answered the conception, as it had been formed and ordained in the mind?

And now that man came to be set up as the object of Divine foreordination, a fresh scene of foreknowledge displayed itself in prosecuting the grand conception to its final goal; and this lay in imparting to him what may be regarded as the basis of immortality, the teaching of the Spirit of God. Here was man already

Digitized by Google

furnished with powers and faculties far surpassing any of the creatures that were before him—faculties capable of being linked on to God Himself, in that they were susceptible of a direct apprehension of the sentiments which pervaded the bosom of God. Man being in himself a material structure of bodily life, with a mind in precise conformity thereto, he stood forth having the wants of that life supplied from, and supported by, the material world on which he dwelt; but if there were no farther interposition on the part of God, he and the whole array of the earth's inhabitants, though made to propagate their kind, each through its own specific circle of existence, allotted under the name of the species, must in the course of time *tend to a natural termination of their existence*, through the waste which must naturally take place in the maintenance of life.

It was for the glory of God, that the manifestation of life thus produced, should not, so to speak, collapse by leaving no wreck behind. The problem then was presented,—How to produce an imperishable being out of perishable material? It would be foreign to my purpose to recapitulate here—How *mind* comes to be educed out of a certain conformation of matter. We have the fact; and here at least we must be contented to accept the fact as presented to us, that from the faintest beginnings of sensation to the largest share of intelligence, we have every grade and variety of consciousness displayed—displayed under a certain structural building up of the animal economy, and in each case representing in consciousness what may be termed the selfhood of that particular economy, according to the cerebral structure pertaining to its own particular body; and so laying in each case the foundation of a *me*. All I can say

Digitized by Google

here is—not that matter as such can ever develop mind, as if mind could ever be regarded as an attribute of matter; but that in the conformation now referred to, a way is opened up for the manifestation of that department of spirit which I call *subjective*—that spirit *out of which mind* is evoked;[1] and seeing that man by reason of his cerebral conformation, as precisely adapted to his bodily structure, has been made a rational being —conscious not only of his own wants, but cognisant also of the wants of others—having perspicacity to see the relation of one thing to another, and to form new relationships in order to answer a purpose—having the power also of analyzing combinations into their constituent elements, and of forming judgments as to the quality and character of things as adapted or otherwise to his own needs, or to the necessities of others—having the power, moreover, of looking into the future, and of providing for the future, with the discernment of a right and a wrong in the process of filling up what is needful for his own purposes, and of his dealing with others—having also the power of using, or of refraining to use, such means as lie within his reach—and especially having the prerogative of envisaging, that there is and must be an unseen Author of existence, as God over all:—Seeing all this, the question arises, How could man as a worldling, carnal by nature, and therefore mortal, but brought to the verge of seeing and apprehending God, be so provided with a spiritual nature, as to be equipped with immortality?

The simple answer to this question is, that God, seeing the need of man for this end, and the capacity of man for acquiring this prerogative; and beholding in

[1] See *Excursus* XIII.

Digitized by Google

all this a progress as thus made towards the accomplishment of His final purpose, determined what was needed, and provided what was needed, for this end: that is, He foreordained the same. He foreordained that man, intrinsically carnal, having the prerogative of a carnal nature, should be taken under His own immediate supervision, in order that express instruction should be supplied to him, direct from Himself, adequate to engraft spiritual life into his nature; and this, in order that said spiritual life should constitute the supreme and authoritative law of his being. The whole resolves itself into this, that God having now the direct foresight of man, as a creature framed with the power of apprehending truth and of discriminating error—as a creature with the capacity of noting right and wrong in the adjustment of his affairs, and withal of looking to, and taking counsel from, the Divine Authority, was induced therefore to impart unto man, what no other creature on the earth was susceptible of receiving, *viz., spiritual guidance under the influence of Divine Authority*—which guidance, as positing in his conscience the true rule of life, constituted *the pivot* on which the responsibility of man hinged for immortality. Here in like manner shines forth the maxim which we have traced all along, and which will be found to prevail throughout, in the whole series of the works of creation, that out of Divine knowledge, as alone furnishing the motives which go to the exercise of will, arose the Divine ordination, that is, *a determination for the best possible condition* of things.

But here comes what may be called a hitch in the process of accomplishing *the best possible constitution of things*—a *crux* which no wisdom could arrest, which not

Digitized by Google

even Divine wisdom could in the circumstances suspend, at least in consistency with the grandeur and glory of His character. As the principle of God, in dealing with man, was *to instruct* him, that is, *to supply motives* to duty in the formation and volition of will; and by no means to force man, as if he were an intelligent machine that is mechanically moved, this problem presented itself to the Divine intelligence (I always speak after the manner of man): Will man, as thus made, in the first place a creature with carnal appetites, and now having Divine instruction for the restraint and regulation of these appetites—will he, when left to his own freedom, maintain the due preponderance of the spiritual ascendency over the carnal impulse? God knew that he would not. Nor is this foreknowledge in the least degree derogatory to the wisdom and glory of God in devising and framing the works of creation as He did. Quite otherwise. Everything (as has been observed) was *the best that could be made:* but now it behoved that an antagonism, which could not by possibility be prevented, must needs be introduced into the constitution of man—an antagonism planted as a necessity, in order to set limits to man's earthliness, and in order to afford scope and freedom to the growth of man's spirituality, as alone preparing him for immortality—an antagonism, therefore, that brought on the danger, impossible to be avoided, that carnal emotions might not always subsist in due subserviency to spiritual motives, and hence the question arose: Would man, under the discipline thus established, when left as he must be left, with the laws of his being to operate even as they had been imparted, and especially when environed with all permissible influences hostile to his integrity,

Digitized by Google

always stand firm and loyal to the spiritual side of his being? or would he run counter to the spiritual, in fulfilling the carnal appetites?

We have not to do here with explaining the process under which the Fall of Man took place. No doubt it took place through the persuasion so cunningly communicated by the tempter, that the command to abstain from the forbidden fruit was a misunderstanding on the part of our first parents, and consequently through the removal of the check which God had imposed to prevent this. It is, however, enough for us here to apprehend that *God foresaw how it would be, and that out of this foresight arose the motive which induced the determination to meet the evil.* Here again we have foreordination springing up out of foreknowledge; and this foreordination was the appointment of a second Adam, who should be prepared to battle with the evil thus brought into the world, and wrest the carnal dominion from its hold upon the soul.

Here once more we arrive at a still further stage of foreordination, in as far as we reach another and new platform of foreknowledge. Christ being resolved on as the foundation of salvation—as the broad ground of eternal life, and as yet without reference to the persons who should be brought to him by election, even as the first Adam was the ground of temporal life to all that should spring from him; and as the foundation must be laid before any structure can be built thereupon—as the fountain of salvation must be opened before the objects of salvation can be posited, so the question now comes to be: How are the objects of salvation to be pitched upon and secured? That is, by what process are men to be *chosen* to receive the benefits of Christ

Digitized by Google

and His salvation? The Scriptures tell us very plainly that there is *no choice whatever*—that previously all men stood alike to God, alike alienated from Him, and alike incapable of doing aught for themselves; and as God was "no Respecter of persons," He could in the circumstances choose none of them to eternal life.

In what way, then, does "the predestination of some to everlasting life" come about? It is answered beautifully, naturally, mercifully, rationally, scripturally, that Christ being now planted as "the one name given under heaven for salvation," it behoved God first of all to give a "general call" in order to prepare the way for a "special call". It is of unspeakable moment, therefore, to note that the *general call prepared the way for the special call.* Since all men, in the foreknowledge of God, were equally helpless to procure their salvation, and since He saw nothing in any, as alienated from Him, to constitute a *ground of choice* of one before another (and here I *stand in direct opposition to Arminian teaching*), so God in these circumstances makes no election whatever. In this the Scriptures shew the absolute impartiality of God, in that God first of all "commandeth *all men* everywhere to repent". This indicates the first approaches of God to a sinful world, and the initiation of the Divine dealing with sinners: in short, this operation of God implies first of all His general assault upon sin, that is, upon all indiscriminately, wherever the voice of God comes to penetrate; and to enforce it He shews the danger in which *all* stand, in that He hath "concluded all under sin," and in that "the wages of sin is death".

Now, here it is, and here it is alone, that a foundation is laid for the exercise of the great principle of Election,

Digitized by Google

or if we will have it so, of Selection, to constitute believers in Jesus. Here, in fact, is obtained the hinge on which alone salvation is made to turn in behalf of the elect. *There must first be an arrestment in sin,* as arising out of conviction of sin; and this, as instigated by the interposition of God, putting forth the terrors of His law against sin. *Then* it is that the crowning principle of the Christian dispensation, *viz.*, faith in the Lord Jesus, can properly be exercised: that is, all who are brought to conviction of sin, and who do truly repent under the application of Divine terrors, are *elected to become believers in the Lord Jesus Christ,* and as such to become recipients of the righteousness of Christ. It is this faith which brings the kingdom of heaven, as a kingdom of righteousness, into the bosom of the elect.

Let us see for a moment how this is developed. What says John the Baptist? "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This means: Repent, for the kingdom of faith, that is, the kingdom of righteousness, is at hand. It means, *Repent that you may believe the Gospel:* that is, repudiate sin that you may receive the righteousness of Christ. There can be no free reception of Jesus Christ and His righteousness, that does not rest upon a foundation of repentance, that is, a repudiation of sin. There must be conviction of sin, before there can be a turning from sin: there must be "repentance towards God" before there can be "faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ". When the Apostles received their commission from their Master, we are told "they went forth and preached that men should repent". The foundation lay in men being brought to repentance; for Christ Himself said, "Except ye repent ye shall perish". "Repent ye (says Peter)

Digitized by Google

and turn again *that your sins may be blotted out*"; and what follows on the back of this? "*that so* (adds Peter) *there may come* seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and *that He may send* the Christ Who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus" (Mark vi. 12; Luke xiii. 3; Acts iii. 19, 20). What was the commission of Christ to the Apostle Paul? "I send thee to the Gentiles to *open their eyes* [to shew them that they have been living in darkness] *that they may turn* from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, *that they may receive remission of their sins*, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Me" (Acts xxvi. 18). As the dispensation to the Jews emphatically taught the knowledge of sin, and through this a conviction of sin, that men might turn from sin, and was therefore pointedly and peculiarly a dispensation of sacrifices, a dispensation of repentance; so on that very account it was the "schoolmaster" to prepare men for Christ, that is, a dispensation that led to the exercise of faith in Christ. Of this John the Baptist is a direct illustration. John the Baptist, as a prophet, was the purest representative of the Old Testament dispensation that had appeared, and his theme was pre-eminently that of Repentance. In this respect, he was pronouncedly the forerunner of our Lord to prepare the way for men embracing Jesus Christ. What does all this scripturally testify and declare? It testifies and declares what is the essential, true, and practical scheme of operation in the process of a sinner coming to be a believer in Jesus Christ.

But this practical scheme of operation is that which stood forth in the foreknowledge and foreordination of God from the beginning. What, then, is the conclu-

Digitized by Google

sion to which we are shut up? Assuredly to this, that God having once laid in His mind the foundation of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the sole and exclusive source of salvation, took the one and only successful plan of bringing man to partake of the Lord Jesus. This plan of necessity divided itself into two parts, the one having the operation of a negative tendency on the sinner, that is, an influence bearing on him to repudiate sin; and the other having the operation of a positive tendency in building up with righteousness the man that had come to be broken down in respect of sin. The latter part could not be effected, but through the former. Hence the determination of God to prepare the way for the accomplishment of the latter, as the crowning part of christianity: hence the general proclamation of human sinfulness, and guilt, and danger, to bring men to a sight and a sense of their danger and misery, and the consequent feeling of the need of a Saviour, and hence the foundation was laid on which to make an election to everlasting life. The very parties thus brought to a stand in respect of their sin, are those on which the eye of God alights to *choose* the same to become inheritors of eternal life. In plain terms, these become the objects of Divine *selection*, that they may be adopted into God's family, and partake of the privileges of the sons of God. Here, then, as before, we have the foreknowledge of God, supplying motives for the foreordination of God; and here we are in a position fairly and adequately to expound the important passage: "Whom He foreknew He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son". There can be no question that the meaning is that, those whom God did foreknow as brought to a sense of, and sorrow for, sin by

Digitized by Google

the operations of His restraining grace in proclaiming the terrors of God on sinners, *even those same He did predestinate* to be conformed to Jesus Christ in His death and in His life, as in Him made new creatures for the performance of good works.

How simple, how easy, how natural, how worthy of God, how impartial yet how beneficent, how comforting and withal how scriptural, is this scheme of Divine Predestination. In all this it comes out most clearly that "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live". In all this, the Church is delivered from difficulties which have divided Christians and alienated them into hostile ranks, such as the election of some sinners to everlasting life, and the reprobation of some sinners, in no worse category, to everlasting woe—such, moreover, as the extent of the death of Christ, forgetting, or rather overlooking, that of necessity the work of Christ had to be resolved upon, before any could be chosen as given unto Christ—difficulties which arise from the erroneous standpoint adopted, and which never have been got over, and never in the circumstances can be. The doctrine of Election must have its own place in the sequence of events in the Divine mind: take it out of that sequence, and all is darkness and confusion. Each act of God in foreordination, like each act of God in creation, must have its own surroundings, and be in express subordination to these. The *Confession of Faith* may give forth conclusions, true in themselves, but they are harsh and distasteful when depicted as the unreasoned whim of God, without the revealment of any grounds save the statement, that such was the sovereign pleasure of God. When it simply tells us that God's election is "without

Digitized by Google

any foresight of faith and good works, as conditions moving him thereto," it is calculated to mislead—to mislead as to the character of God in dealing with His creatures—to mislead as to the process of Divine predestination—to mislead in that a man might, on the one hand, erroneously regard himself as a helpless outcast in the hands of a sovereign tyrant—to mislead, also, in that a man might, on the other hand, without any good grounds, imagine himself one of the elect by making a loud profession, while yet he really followed the devices and desires of his own heart. But how stands the fact? God looking upon a world of transgressors cannot choose one before another; seeing "He hath concluded all under sin". God in mercy, therefore, proclaims among mankind the danger under which they lie; and while some turn a deaf ear to His call, and therefore are rejected, some there are that are arrested by His call, and are chosen to become heirs of salvation.

It is obvious, thence, that the process whereby Calvin's sovereign good pleasure of God operates, as well as the scheme to which the name of Arminius is attached, must both be modified. For while, contrary to the Arminian doctrine, the Election of God is not grounded in any conditions primarily or natively found in the creature; so also, contrary to the Calvinistic view, the Election of God is not an off-hand dictum, of which no account can be given; and more especially does he misplace the order of election, by his first ordaining certain sinners to everlasting life, and then ordaining a Saviour to take charge of them. The former is an impossibility: the latter is an incompatibility. In all the arrangements of God, it will ever be found, tha

Digitized by Google

God is neither the author of confusion, nor the abetter of aught that is unmerciful. Every expression of His will hath its own appropriate place and its own appropriate motive. In this consideration, difficulties are removed, reason is satisfied, Scripture is harmonized, the operations of God are justified, and science is brought into the region of theology.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS II.

ON THE GROUNDS OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY.

THERE is no evidence fron Revelation that Adam had immortality as regards his body, or that immortality essentially belonged to his body. The evidence is all the other way. The proclamation "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," indicates with tolerable clearness, the perishable character of man from the beginning. True, it may be said, that man was not wholly and absolutely dust, in that he was inherently made soul or spirit, which would seem to involve immortality. Soul or spirit (it is said) cannot be broken into parts: we cannot (as in the case of body) have a part here and a part there: Yet soul is intellectually the reflex, the counterpart of the bodily economy: it is so in every animal creature without exception; and it is so in man; only in man, it by and by becomes expanded through the special knowledge that is acquired by him, not only immediately through the senses, but in the exercise of reason.

I shall have something to say hereafter on the great question of spirit-substance generally, of its wonderful properties, of its inexhaustible energy, as the foundation of force; and this as distinguished from, and contrasted with matter, whose prerogative is limitation, *and limita-*

Digitized by Google

tion in precise accordance with the quality or qualities which characterize it. Here I may venture to note that *absolutely and primordially there is but one all-pervading spirit*—spirit at once unlimited in extension and unlimited in potentiality. Spirit, as quality fundamentally, embraces two distinct departments; the one, the foundation of the Subjective side, and the other, the foundation of the Objective side, in nature—two departments which never can be confounded: spirit, therefore, affords infinite scope for individualities of every possible kind, individualities in the purely unconscious field of mere matter, and individualities also through these, in the arena of mind in animal nature, according as organizations develop the objective department only, or through these give scope, under a nervous system, for the manifestation of the subjective; and therefore of a consciousness of its own objective being:—spirit, consequently, is not only all-pervading, as the foundation of the whole economy of being, but ranges in personalities from the uncreated *form of God*, as the prime Mover and Source of all inferior formation, throughout the whole arena of formations in the celestial or terrestrial spheres:—spirit, finally, is the foundation of all laws in the universe from its inherent potentiality; and of necessity operates in precise accordance with the qualities of substance pertaining to each object. If ever a knowledge is to be obtained of the laws of the universe, not merely as to the facts of our experience, but as to the grounds on which their ever varied but determinate operation rests, we must obtain some such grasp of the nature of spirit as is here indicated: and in this way we shall be able to *account* for the facts which Pantheism has laid hold of as the treasure-house of its

Digitized by Google

home, and at the same time to *account* for the foundation of those facts, as the creature-agency primarily produced by the uncreated Personality.

I premise thus far, that it may be seen in what way I account for the origin of souls.[1]

It will be admitted as being no easy task in a few brief observations, to make the statements now presented at once obvious and convincing; but it is believed that there are facts in science that will bear out, in the *first* place, the wonderful attributes of spirit as such, in respect of its exhaustless energy or potentiality: in the *second* place, the fact of a twofold department of quality, as displayed in the fundamental subsistence of an objective and subjective side therein: in the *third* place, the fact of the conversion of the objective into special limitations (atoms), each having its own specific quality; and that consequently these limitations, as being each and all of them derived from one and the same parent-source, must have necessarily a blood-relationship, *i.e.*, an affinity for one another: which affinity is manifested by an attraction for, or a repulsion of, one another, according to the relation in which they are made to stand to each other, when being brought into combination: in the *fourth* place, that the primitive, uncreated, absolute, all-pervading spirit must have a sympathy with the created atomism in its varied

[1] I have said that there are two departments of spirit, the one the foundation of the objective, which I call *etherial*, and as such is the source of all matter,—the other the foundation of the subjective, which I call *intellectual*, and as such is the source of all mind: the former being possible in its development without the latter; but the latter not possible in its manifestation apart from the former. Souls therefore demand both departments. And when the objective side, as in contact with the body, is formed into a *me*, the subjective side has the consciousness of the *me*.

Digitized by Google

characteristics, as supplying from itself the energy which this atomism naturally demands as the expression of its particular condition, and consequently as founding and initiating the laws which this atomism, when built up into molecular masses, of necessity displays in what are called the forces of nature: in the *fifth* place, that, while the structured atomism of an objective framework fulfils the laws of its construction, and does shew forth the operations of its nature with unconscious accuracy, there will be manifested, in those particular cases where scope is opened up for its possibility, and as far as scope is opened up, by an animal organization, the phenomenon of a material structure being also endowed with a consciousness of its own, *i.e.*, a subjective ideal of its own selfhood, *i.e.*, a cognition of an inner self as allied to the outer self; said cognition being the conscious representation of its own inner objectivity: in the *sixth* place, that an *ego* being thus founded, it becomes enlarged by the fresh introduction of impressions through the *external senses* of the bodily economy. In the case of man, this enlargement is almost unlimited, not only by the fact of the external senses or gateways of knowledge communicating with the external world, and drawing constantly repeated momenta therefrom to fill the soul, but by the fact of the *internal senses* of the bodily economy, *i.e.*, of the cerebral apparatus, adapted to manipulate upon the pabulum thus supplied, and to manipulate for the purposes of abstraction and generalization,—for the purposes of memory and imagination,—for the purposes of reasoning, and of devising in order to the prosecution of an end or object; all which, when constituted as ideas, becomes the furniture of what is psychically called "the inner man".

Digitized by Google

If what has now been hinted at shall be found to bear analysis, and to fulfil all the requirements of science in the exposition of the phenomena of the world, it is obvious that there must hereby be displayed a fresh vista of intelligence, as the very grounds of all science—the science of matter and the science of force, as having its foundations in matter; and through these the science of mind, as the ultimate science of all sciences. This subject will be further considered when I shall have occasion more immediately to discuss the psychological problem.

I shall only here call attention to the fact that the *conscious self* of every animal creature (and man stands fundamentally in this category) is but the subjective reflection or counterpart of its own inner objectivity; and that said *inner objectivity*, as spirit, has its formation and character from that *outer objectivity* which constitutes the material framework: hence the personality of the inward self or ego is primarily founded on, and formed from, the outward man, as begotten by ordinary generation, and formed therefrom. If this view be correct, it follows of course that *the conscious ego, as constituted from the outward man, cannot intrinsically have immortality.* The body of the flesh cannot give what it has not of itself to give. True it is, that the substance of the soul is spirit-substance, and that it cannot be destroyed as such; but if the conditions which are imparted thereto, are those merely of perishable matter, it does not follow but that those conditions may be blotted out; and that they will be blotted out, when the circumstances which maintain them in being shall have been removed. Hence we are bound to infer that the conscious *me* of man, as well as of the

Digitized by Google

inferior creation, as being begotten of the flesh—the rational as well as the irrational nature—cannot have immortality; for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," that is, if it is occupied or filled with carnal conditions only which have in themselves no inherent immortality, these conditions, however enlarged in man, on account of the accessions which a rational nature confers; yet, as purely confined to material things, cannot bestow what they do not themselves possess. If material qualities be essentially perishable, we can hardly infer that the stamp or impress of them, though upon an immaterial ground, can be imperishable.

And the dictum of Holy Scripture confirms this, when we come to understand the nature of repentance; for what is repentance, but the *casting out from the soul* principles formerly held by the soul—principles that shall no longer constitute the life of the soul; and again, what is faith in Jesus Christ, but the *receiving into the soul* the principles which constitute the life of Jesus Christ; and so receiving them, by making them our own, as the new life in us, they constitute the life of immortality. Our souls, under the discipline of Christianity, are thus made conscious of something more than the lust of things pertaining to the body; they are being constantly filled, through the hearing and the reading of God's Word, with ideas of God, and of Christ and of the righteous principles which pervade the bosom of God, and which are revealed for our learning, and which constitute the foundation of a life that cannot die.

But it may be asked: May not the world, as a reflex of God, give immortality? It would perhaps be difficult to draw the line of demarcation as to its being a

Digitized by Google

reflex of God, in as far as a knowledge of God may through these be conveyed to the soul. We are expressly told that "in the knowledge of God standeth our eternal life"; and that "this is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent". The grounds of immortality then, upon Scripture-principles, are made perfectly consistent with the grounds of our living consciousness, so far as the world and the flesh are concerned. Only let God pour into the soul something of Himself, indirectly or directly from Himself—something indicating a knowledge of His being, *i.e.*, a knowledge of His righteousness, *i.e.*, a knowledge to some extent of His nature and character; then the seeds of immortality are thereby dropped into our mental being. And, rightly understood, the foundation of an immortal body is hereby laid. That there *may be* an immortal body along with an immortal soul, will not be doubted by any believer in the Scriptures, where we are told, that there are "bodies celestial," as well as "bodies terrestrial"—spiritual bodies as well as carnal bodies. We must believe, however, that the very training and discipline to which man had to be subjected in his estate of innocence, enforced a change on the terrestrial, *i.e.*, a preparation for the celestial, as the destiny for which he was intended. In which case, it will be found that the immortal life is founded on, and developed from, the condition into which the soul is brought under the training of Heaven.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS III.

ON OBJECTIONS TO CHRIST'S TAKING A LITERAL INCARNATION OF OUR FLESH.

Mr. Bingham in his "Immanuel" inquires into human nature in general, and that with respect to its essence, its properties and accidents, its condition as it came originally from the Maker's hand, what it has become accidentally so to speak, as to matters not involved in its essence since the fall, and what it will become in the redeemed after the resurrection.

Having (as he says) thus far cleared the ground, he goes on to "advance into the heart of the chief topic now in hand, *viz.*, *the quality of our blessed Lord's manhood*"; and here a few observations may be permitted.

It does not surely tell us much when we are informed that man's "whole *essence* is of two component parts—a material and exquisitely organized body, and an immaterial and highly intellectual soul," or that there are three principles, "body, soul, and spirit," having existence and life. What we desiderate is a definition of essence as explanatory of qualities. Nor does it tell us much as to the *properties* or *accidents* of the essence that "man held a middle place between angels and the lower animals". Allowing that statement

Digitized by Google

to be proved, and that man had "surprising faculties of body and of mind fitting him to rule other creatures and to serve and love His Maker," what we are at a loss for, is the *accidental* property which does not necessarily belong to the *essence.* Does the Author mean to tell us that it was an accident of man's nature to have rational faculties, for example? We should say that these belong to the very essentials of humanity as distinguishing manhood from any other creature on the earth, and without which he could not be truly man. Nor does it tell us much that the *condition* of our manhood as it came from God was "glorious, holy, and happy". True it is, he tells us, that man was created in "the image of God"; and had he intimated in what the image of God consists, and on what it is grounded, we should have a general knowledge of man's *created* condition. As to the *fallen* condition again, Mr. Bingham tells us that Eden was forfeited, the image of God lost, moral rectitude, integrity, and peace gone, physical and mental powers impaired, phrenzy, sickness, suffering, a sense of divine wrath introduced. All this might be true, although we do not know that all this was immediately true. But all this fails to indicate that precise change on man's economy, out of which the whole cohort of evils, affecting man, has arisen. To do justice to this subject, we require to know what the body is, and what the soul is in relation to the body—what the prerogatives were of man's created state, and how these affected him—what the fall indicated and implied, and what was put away or lost by the fall. We would require to know, in fact, under what circumstances a soul is developed in the body and matured through the body; and under what circumstances a soul takes on

Digitized by Google

the image of God (as consisting not in knowledge only, but in knowledge *and* righteousness), and under what circumstances it is bereft of that image. We would require generally to know the operation of the human faculties, and the circumstances under which they function; we would require to know what is sin, as contrasted with what is righteousness; and what it is that strictly has brought the soul into an estate of sin, as contrasted with a condition of righteousness. We are far from thinking these to be impossible questions, or questions nowadays beyond our range. We think data exist out of which principles may be evolved for the solution of the deepest mental problems—principles which hold good as tests of truth, in every fair application of them. I must here refer to the remarks on "the Psychological Problem". But what of our Lord's humanity?

Mr. Bingham goes on to inquire into "the quality of our blessed Saviour's humanity"; and while he allows that "when the Eternal Word was made flesh, *He took upon Him our nature, with all its essential properties*," he asks—"According to which mode of its threefold manner of subsistence did the incarnate Son take humanity unto Himself?" Our Author allows that "the King is seen in His beauty," through His ascension into the heavens, according to the highly-wrought figure of John in Rev. i. 13-17; and that on earth "His visage was marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men—that "He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief"—one "esteemed as striken, smitten of God, and afflicted". He thinks that "the flesh of Christ was not in every respect the same as Adam's before the fall in Paradise": he thinks

Digitized by Google

that in essence and properties it was *identical with our flesh*, otherwise in the fullest sense He could not have been "our brother," and "really one of us, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, able to be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and to sympathize with His people". For all this he refers to Deut. xviii. 15, compared with Acts iii. 22; Heb. ii. 11, 14, 17, 18; Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Isaiah liii. 3; Peter ii. 21. He allows that "the first Adam, while yet unfallen, was subject to no pain, and knew no want, while Jesus hungered and thirsted, became faint and weary and exhausted, alive to the acuteness of pain in His body, while His soul quailed under paroxysms of mental anguish". He concludes thus:—"It has been proved that His mode of subsistence here in the flesh was neither that precisely of Adam before the fall, nor that of man restored after the resurrection: it follows that our Lord did verily and indeed assume His humanity *similar* to the nature of man in his fallen and altered condition, with respect to the *accidents* of our real humanity, or as the 15th Article terms it, 'the truth of our nature'."

This language is tolerably strong; but as if afraid of its bearing, he immediately writes as follows:—"Let my readers particularly observe what I state. I say not that our Lord assumed *a fallen nature:* God forbid! for such a sentiment would be rank heresy, indeed. Neither do I say that He assumed our nature in its *fallen state*, which would be heresy equally gross." And he goes on to make long quotations from Dods on the Incarnation, from Archbishop Usher's *Immanuel*, and from St. Augustine in his book concerning the deserts and remission of sins.

Digitized by Google

I can but here notice the conclusions of our Author, who adopts the following from Mr. Dods:—"The Word, which was made flesh, was 'in the beginning; and was God with God'. But however His participation of our humiliation, that we might partake of His exaltation, held a certain middle course, even in the nativity of His flesh; so that we should be born in sinful flesh, but He 'in the likeness of sinful flesh': that we should be born not only of flesh and blood, but also of the will of man, and of the will of the flesh; but He only of flesh and blood, and not of the will of man, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God. We therefore are born unto death on account of sin; but He, on account of us, was born unto death without sin. And as His humiliation was not in all respects equalled to our humiliation, even so our exaltation will not be equalled to His exaltation. We shall be made sons of God by His grace, but He was always by nature the Son of God. We, when converted, shall be united to God as inferiors—He, never needing conversion, remains equal with God. We are made partakers of eternal life, He is life eternal. He alone, therefore, even when made man, still remaining God, never had any sin, nor took sinful flesh, though He took it of the sinful flesh of His mother. For what flesh He took of her, that truly He either purified that it might be assumed, or He purified it in the assumption. Wherefore He created whom He might choose, and chose from whom He might be created, a virgin mother, not conceiving by the law of sinful flesh, that is, by the motion of a carnal concupiscence, but by a pious faith deserving to have the holy seed formed in her. How much more, then, ought sinful flesh to be baptized, in order to escape condemnation, if that flesh

Digitized by Google

which had no sin was baptized, as an example for our imitation."

It does venture far, we think, to say that our Lord was baptized, having no intrinsic need of baptism; but only as an example for our imitation. We thought that the Lord Himself deemed it necessary in order *to fulfil all righteousness;* in which case we should infer that the baptism of Christ, as a dedication of the flesh unto death, and of the soul to the Spirit of life, was an essential and intrinsic necessity, betokening the work given Him to do.

What room there is for saying that Christ "held a middle course in the nativity of His flesh," I cannot discover. It is said to be "*our* flesh and blood" in the plainest and most positive language that can be employed. The Author says "*we* are born in sinful flesh," but *He only* "in the likeness of sinful flesh": by which he would have us to understand that Christ was but a mockery of our nature—a *painted* imitation of sinful flesh—that likeness means unlikeness—that essentially He had not our sinful flesh, and, therefore, was not "made sin"; and in short, that He had no sacrifice to render, and was not made under the law. Can this be admitted? The words are, ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. viii. 3). Let us compare the words with the corresponding language in Phil. ii. 7, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος—which we translate, "being made (or begotten) in the *likeness* of men". If we take the interpretation of Messrs. Bingham and Dods, we shall say that here it is declared that Christ is coloured only as a man—that He is only the imitation of a man, and that essentially He is not man, for that "likeness" means essentially *unlikeness.* We might take

Digitized by Google

another passage (Heb. ii. 17), where Christ is said κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοις ὁμοιοθῆναι—which we translate, "made in all things *like* unto His brethren". But Messrs. Bingham and Dods, to be consistent, must interpret this as merely having an outside appearance or tinge like to His brethren, and that likeness does not mean what it says,—that it means but *the aspect or seeming complexion* of manhood, and not its identity or reality! These gentlemen little know the danger of their interpretation. They practically deny that Jesus has come in the flesh: they practically deny that Jesus has descended into the very depths of our nature for its recovery: they therefore take away from Him the very ground of His Redeemership—the very means whereby alone He could make redemption possible—the very offering by which alone He could make an atonement for sin! They do this no doubt in the dread of ascribing sin to the Saviour. The Saviour of course could not be contaminated by sin, as respects His divine nature; and even as respects His human nature, though He felt the burden of sin, and recoiled from the entertainment of sin in His soul, yet assuredly it cannot be questioned, when we consider the assaults to which He was subjected by the devil and the world and the flesh, that "He was in *all* points tempted like as we are"; only in respect of any success attending these assaults, He was "without sin".

But if *the flesh* of man be demonstrated to be fundamentally *the ground of the sin* of man in his present carnal and fallen condition, assuredly we must believe that Christ was "made sin," when He was "made flesh"; and yet we frankly admit that in His case, He was, as *the consecrated son of God*, "that holy thing

Digitized by Google

which was born" of the Virgin Mary. Christ, therefore, as man, though born with *our* flesh and blood, as being the flesh and blood which He received from His mother, was not born in a fallen condition as we are, in as far as in the first place He was *not mere man*, *i.e.*, He was not exclusively man in utter helplessness as we are; for His human soul was not in the condition of mere carnal manhood, in that it was overseen, instructed, and in a sense protected by the Divine Spirit, of which He was inherently and essentially the possessor. He had not the less, however, to contend with the enemies which beset the soul of man, *viz.*, the devil and the world and the flesh; which enemies, in the case of ordinary man, reigned triumphant in the soul; and He contending against them, therefore, had an arduous battle to wage and to overcome. We are told He did "overcome"; and now as the Head of a race of manhood, regenerated by that very "law of the Spirit of life" of which He was Himself a partaker "without measure," and which is bestowed as a free and unmerited gift upon us, and is received as "the precious blood of Christ" by us, when we have true faith—the blood which animated Christ, the blood of true spiritual life, the blood which flows in the bosom of God—the blood which alone washes the soul, which alone sanctifies the soul, which alone perfects the soul for glory, which animated Christ to offer up His body on the tree, and which constitutes us "kings and priests" unto God, that we may present our own bodies as "a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to God".

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS IV.

ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF MARY.

It may be said that such an act as rendering Mary the mother of Jesus immaculate, might well be said to have been effected by the Son of God Himself, in preparation for His own conception; and as anticipating the redemption which He was to work out, even as in a sense that redemption must be regarded as anticipated in respect of those Old Testament saints, that have been saved. I reply that the two cases are wholly different. The Old Testament saints, in the first place, went through an ordeal of training for acceptance with God, and they were conscious of the discipline whereby sin was abandoned, and whereby the sacrifice of sin was attained, and in the second place, with all their training, none of them were rendered immaculate. Here, in the case of the Virgin Mary, is a woman said to be made sinless,—not through any disciplinary teaching and training,—not through the process which God had ordained, the process of repentance and faith,—not through any line of operation of which she was made cognisant, but by the mere stroke of the Divine arm, *secretly* wielded, of which she could give no account whatever. Assuredly this is not the way of redemption propounded by God in His covenant of salvation.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS V.

ON THE CONNECTION OF BODY AND SOUL.

I CANNOT here enlarge on the process whereby the soul, as a spirit-entity, is affected by the body; and also by the things of the world, as material-entities, we are directly conscious of the fact; and this consciousness is the *highest evidence* we can possess of the fact: it is a consciousness which carries its evidence with unquestioning conviction to every mind. Nobody denies that the soul is affected by the body, and variously affected according to the various states to which the body happens to be reduced; and nobody denies that the soul again operates upon the body, and that the body is moved variously according to the volitions or behests of the soul. The fact stands indisputable, that the soul, as a *cognitive* power, is affected by means of impressions made through the external senses—that emotions also arise out of these communications, and that out of these emotions there is the exercise of will; and that the soul, as volitional, operates upon the bodily members, which move precisely as they are thus acted upon or influenced by the will.

For the present, let us be contented to take the fact, without entering into the explanation of the fact. That the fact admits of explanation needs not be ques-

Digitized by Google

tioned; and so soon as *data* appears, we may rest assured these *data* will be employed for ascertaining the process in virtue of which mind and matter, as in the animal framework, are mutually connected, and found mutually working upon one another; and before this enquiry is brought to a close, I shall venture to offer some considerations whereby some of the arcana of life may be evolved. Taking hold of facts in the meantime, which are not gainsaid, it may be farther indicated, that the soul can receive cognitions from the Holy Spirit, as well as from the world. We must believe that this can be in an ordinary and extraordinary way. The Apostles and Prophets, for example, had communications made to them in an extraordinary way, when they had the intimation of things to come, and the revelation of special light, out of the ordinary channel. This extraordinary way is properly called miraculous, and all miracle is exceptional to the appointed channel for natural and established usage; and we are not entitled to question the power of God or the wisdom of God to adopt extraordinary measures, when extraordinary occasion requires them, in laying the foundation of a new organization in the world.

This being premised, we are in circumstances to receive impressions from the Holy Ghost, in the ordinary way, that is, through the senses, when we read or hear read, the inspired Word of God; and in this way, as all will and volition arise in direct connection with the communications made to the mind (and it is all-important to note this), so does the Spirit's influence prevail, according to the way in which these communications are *received*. As regards the Holy Spirit, it is now by no means needful to suppose a secret and mysterious

Digitized by Google

operative power, working in some extraordinary and inconceivable way, that is miraculously, in *our* case, and after a fashion of which we can give no account; for in *our* case, as a rule, no such mysterious interposition is known; but the Holy Spirit, having once revealed, in an extraordinary manner, the whole body of needful truth, as the revelation of God to man in the sacred Scriptures; and having had this recorded in a permanent form for the instruction and edification of the Church, we are "made partakers of the Divine nature," by the reading and the preaching of the Word. Hence we must have *knowledge* of the Holy Spirit's principles before we can have *emotion* in behalf of these principles; just as we must have emotion before we can have *will* to put these into practice. And that knowledge is obtained through the instrumentality of our external senses.

Now, what do these facts clearly and indisputably establish? Why, this—that *the soul is the creature of that which begets its individuality.* Hence *the soul is naturally and first the creature of the flesh.* Its individuality comes from the body, and is established on a ground which yields forth the consciousness of its particulars. There are two grounds, the body and the spirit: the former, individualized by its own particulars through ordinary generation; and the latter, having a receptivity for these particulars, but having the attribute which yields a consciousness of them. What complicates a full understanding of the soul is the fact, that it has an objective side, as in immediate connection with the body, and a subjective side, as the crowning feature of its inner selfhood in displaying understanding and knowledge. It is the objective side of soul which takes

Digitized by Google

on the complexion or form of that which is grounded in, and which emanates from, the body of the flesh; which, therefore, acquires what may be called the personality of the soul; it is the subjective side which lightens up a consciousness of this inner personality. As a creature thus begotten of the body of the flesh, the soul is in Scripture called a ψυχίκη ψυχὴ, a *soulish soul*, that is, an *animal soul*, or a σαρκίκη ψυχὴ, that is, a soul characterized *by the flesh, i.e., a carnal soul*—a soul swayed by the affections and passions of the bodily system. (See Greek N. T., Jas. iii. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 14, Rom. vii. 14, 2 Cor. i. 12.)

But while "that is first which is *natural*" or *soulish*, as partaking from the animal frame, the soul may be transformed into that which Scripture terms a πνευματίκη ψυχὴ, a *spiritual soul*. The soul is in this latter case termed the *creature of the Spirit*. How is this transformation brought about? The simple answer is, when the things of the Holy Spirit, that is, the things of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Gospel, are conveyed thereto and established thereon, a peculiar process takes place, as the soul undergoes this transformation. It has gradually to get rid of the complexion it acquired from the bodily economy, and as gradually to put on the complexion which it acquires from the teaching of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures. Hence what is called "the renewal of the soul". It is said to be made anew in the image of God, by a hearty reception of the principles which come from God, as these are revealed in the Word of God. The substance of the soul is compared to a parchment on which writing is engrossed, and it is characterized by that writing, whatever it may be. The Apostle Paul speaks of "the handwriting of ordinances"

Digitized by Google

which has to be "blotted out," as being "against us"—an expression, as thus rendered, not always correctly understood; it should be "the handwriting in its demands" as inferring a certain line of thought and action, inimical to us, as alienating us from God and bringing death to the soul. This was the work of Jesus Christ, so far as His own person was touched by the flesh; but then, at the same time, He substituted, as another handwriting on the soul, what came from the Divine Spirit within Him, and thus He brought in a new manhood absolutely pure and perfect. And this is the process which He effects in us, by the scheme which He has established under the Gospel—a scheme which demands the exercise of Repentance on our part to lay aside the carnal, and of Faith on our part to lay up the righteousness of Christ, in which case, the soul becomes "a new creature created in Christ Jesus unto good works"—a scheme under which we become "the epistles of Christ known and read by all men".

It is obvious from what has just been advanced, that, as now born into the world, the soul fundamentally cannot be other than carnal, seeing its individuality is of necessity first of all begotten out of the carnal properties belonging to the body of the flesh; for the flesh cannot transmit other than the things of itself. "That which is begotten or born of the flesh is flesh," that is, it bears the characteristic of the carnal. A soul, again, that is under the discipline and the teaching of the Spirit, of necessity becomes spiritual; for "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," that is, it bears the characteristic or impress of the spiritual. Hence we realize also the truth of the Apostle's words in Cor. xv. 46: "that is *not first* which is spiritual, but that which is

Digitized by Google

natural (sensuous or carnal), and *afterwards* that which is spiritual". And not only is it true historically, that "the first man is of the earth earthy, and the second man (is born) from heaven"; but it is true by procreation that the first manhood is of the flesh, *carnal;* and the second manhood of the Spirit, *heavenly;* and "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," that is, if we are thus prepared to inherit the kingdom of God.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS VI.

ON THE NATURE OF REDEMPTION.

It is not sufficiently recognised and considered that, the body of the flesh being the source and foundation of human sin, in as far as it exercises free dominion in the soul through the loss of the Spirit, there must be first and fundamentally the crucifixion or death of the flesh, as the dominating power in the soul; and that this death of the flesh, as a power in the soul, is and must be fundamentally the very root of the scheme which points to the redemption of the soul. It is the removal of "the body of sin" from the soul, not only as a burden and a weight on the soul, but emphatically as a dominating power therein, that constitutes the ground of redemption, that is, the deliverance of the soul from the source of sin. In order to this, the body of sin has to be assaulted and sacrificed in respect of untoward desires; and when it is thus sacrificed, it is no longer a power over the soul; and the soul, in that case, is no longer under the dominion of sin: it is redeemed from sin; and not only redeemed from the power and dominion of sin, in respect that the flesh is mortified in its members; but as thus redeemed, it is of necessity opened up to receive a new and better set of principles, even the things brought from Christ by the Holy Ghost, and so

Digitized by Google

it becomes sanctified by grace: the body all the while, as the object in which sinful incitements remain, being doomed to die: to die, first of all, *relatively* in respect of its untoward cravings, so that the soul should by discipline become comparatively free by the repudiation of sinful impulses still lingering therein; but in the end to die *absolutely*, so that the soul should thus be wholly separated from any and every influence pertaining to its connection with the body. In the former case, we see that the soul now obtains redemption or deliverance by a relative dying to sinful impulses: in the latter case, we see that the soul obtains redemption by the absolute death of the body, as no longer a power in any sense at all. Of course, at the absolute death, the soul may be found a carnalized thing, in which case, it must submit to the destruction called the second death; but if during the life of the body the soul has been subordinated to the influences of the Spirit, and hath submitted to the purifying power of the Spirit, then a redeeming process has taken effect on the soul, while yet the body is alive and in activity in the world; and in this redeeming process, the foundation of a spirit-body is laid in the etherial portion of the soul. And hence we understand what the Apostle means, when he says, "We which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23). The redemption of our body is subsequent to the redemption of our souls. We obtain the redemption of our souls in this world—the world that now is, when through the aid of the Holy Spirit we are enabled to "abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul": we obtain the redemption of our

Digitized by Google

bodies only on the morning of the resurrection. This, as being the crowning act of redemption, is sometimes by way of pre-eminence styled "the day of redemption".

Absolute redemption is not possible so long as the body is a living framework upon the earth, because notwithstanding all the discipline we are called to undergo in "mortifying our members which are upon the earth," there will always be left some tendency in one direction or another to sinful impulse, supported as that impulse is by the allurements of a sinful world; and hence a constant liability or possibility of the soul (though redeemed) being brought for a time within the meshes of sin; but when once the body is absolutely dead, all possible impulses to sin as from that source are dead likewise, and the whole life of sin, so far as it comes from the body, has in consequence perished. When, therefore, all sinful prompting is gone, all sinful tendency must of course also be gone, if the soul has already been redeemed from subjection to the law of the flesh.

Now, we can understand with tolerable distinctness what are the arrangements of God for our redemption and salvation. They may briefly be expressed thus:— Having once laid the "foundation" of a *finished work* in regard to redemption from all dominion of the flesh, and of the world, and of the devil, Jesus Christ, Who was made flesh of our flesh, and blood of our blood, having mortified and crucified these, through a soul clothed with the righteousness of God, coming from the Eternal Spirit, of which He was the partaker, *we have the application* of this purchased redemption made over unto us, by the effusion of the precious blood which animated and animates His being; and what

Digitized by Google

results have we therefrom? We have, first of all, the Spirit for the stanching of the life of the flesh within us, which is the life of sin, which stanching consists in our abjuring the law of the flesh for the government of our souls: and we have, second, the same Spirit for the impartation of the life of God within us, which is the life of righteousness; and this change wrought upon us is called Regeneration. All this is directly applicable to the soul, as weaned from the body and from the world; and while the body is thus weakened as a sinful power, the body has finally to die, as carrying in it the last remnants of sin, which beset the soul; and when it thus dies, it is finally discharged, and the soul is no longer beset by the impulses to sin which the body, in its present existence, begets and furnishes; and the redemption of the body has then to be effected, *i.e.*, a new body, as a spirit-body, will take the place of the present at the resurrection. This comes forth out of the redeemed soul, as the seed of the spirit-body, which shall be manifested on the day of the resurrection. We are not yet in circumstances to speak of this spirit-body, nor how it comes to pass that the spiritualized soul comes to be the depositary of that future development which is to be manifested when souls shall have their full manifestation in the activities of celestial life. I trust some insight may be obtainable under the discussion, on which I hope to enter, as touching the Psychological Problem.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS VII.

ON THE FOUNDATIONS OF PRIESTHOOD.

THE point as to Christ having "somewhat to offer" to God, in the exercise of priesthood, has been too much overlooked. It is one of the most important considerations in the great question of atonement. It is allowed on all hands (that is where Socinian principles do not prevail) that Christ made atonement; but many are sadly at sea as to the things which it behoved Christ, as a Priest to have, in order to the due exercise of the priestly office, for an efficient sacrifice for sin. It is an alarming thought, if many are to be found to some extent depriving Christ of that which could alone make Him a proper victim for the Sacrifice due by man unto God. There was one sacrifice fundamentally due, without which, as has been noted, all other sacrifices were vain; and that was *the sacrifice of sin.* Sin was the very element which alienated man from God, which made man offensive to God, which kept man away from God; and unless that offensive thing were taken out of the way, as the indispensable foundation of an acceptable approach to God, God could not be satisfied: God could not be satisfied with any offering where sin is harboured, nay, God could not be satisfied with our approaches to Him unless sin were covered, and the

Digitized by Google

power of the Spirit were displayed. Here then lies the difficulty: How, by any possibility, could Christ take away sin, if absolutely He had no sin? And how could Christ be a mediator between God and man, and therefore a representative of man before God, if He had not with Him the very things to lay down as sacrifices before God, the things which God demanded to be laid down as attestations of man's absolute abnegation of sin, as attestations of the sacrifice and destruction of sin? Christ, in coming before God, must come in two capacities: first, as the exponent of man's condition and as the deliverer from that condition; and second, as one entirely in harmony with God. He must come on the one hand, as a pure spotless worshipper, glorifying God in heart and spirit; and, on the other hand, with the burden of human sin upon Him, as heavy upon Him, and as hateful to Him, and as a distress to Him, and as an incubus and encumbrance on Him, as a trammel and drawback of which He was resolved to be freed; and to the removal and destruction of which He had devoted Himself, whatever pain and distress the process of so doing should cost Him. And what was this burden of human sin with which Christ was weighted, and by which Christ was cumbered? It was the body of our flesh and blood, with all its natural impulses playing upon Him. That body of our flesh and blood gave to Christ a personal consciousness of man's estate,—a personal feeling of man's infirmities,—a personal cognisance of the pressure of sinful tendencies on the human soul. Christ carried all that is in man before God, but carried it—not as a personal element harboured in his soul, but only to be laid on the altar of God for utter destruction. Penetrated by the Divine

Digitized by Google

Spirit in His own soul, and submissive to the Divine Spirit in all things, that soul stood before God ready to endure to the uttermost, every pang which was unavoidable in order to the sacrifice of this abomination; and until this abomination should be completely swept away He could not be said to be "sanctified" or "perfected". Christ then "had somewhat to offer"; and the offering up of the very foundations of sin in sacrifice to God made the sacrifice to be "the savour of a sweet smell to God,"—not because Christ suffered pain (for the pain or suffering endured by the Son of God was not in itself, and could not be in itself, any satisfaction to God), but because He took away sin thereby. By denying then that Christ had a body of flesh and blood in all respects the same as ours; or which is the same thing, by insisting that Christ had a body which needed no "cures", and required no "self-denials," we thereby deprive Him of the very ground on which alone He could occupy our place,—of the very ground on which alone He could come before God in our behalf,—of the very ground on which alone He could fairly stand forth in man's name before God, and as a Priest make the Sacrifice which was indispensable in order to human recovery.

What is the meaning of the word sacrifice? It means abolition or demolition: it implies dilapidation and extermination; it is the *absolute upgiving of what is essentially ours;* it is a final parting with, and parting from, something which we, by God's grace, have doomed shall be separated forever from us. Any other meaning I hold to be only an evasion of the question at issue; and if I have given the correct meaning of sacrifice, then see to what dilemma we are reduced, if we say

Digitized by Google

that Jesus had no burden to be removed, no encumbrance to be cast off. We deny at once that He was in that case a partaker of our frame, we deny that He was a sharer of our condition, we deny that He entered into our estate, we deny that He properly laid hold of what is ours, we deny Him the very means of bringing in redemption; we, in fact, deny His Redeemership, though we may not wish to do so. If we ascribe to Jesus Christ not only divinity which we cordially admit, but a humanity that had nothing in it of that which required rectification, we prevent Him having any part or lot with us in that very thing which He came into the world to fulfil, and which alone demanded His incarnated presence on earth. If the incarnation of Christ was not the incarnation which assimilated Him to us, if His flesh and blood were perfect from the beginning, and furnishing no emotions for the soul which required to be sacrificed, then what of necessity follows? Why this, that God put forth His hand to wound, to maim, and to destroy that which was altogether in harmony with Himself, and acceptable to Himself! Can we suppose this? Can we suppose that God would thrust the sword of vengeance into His own perfect handiwork? Can we understand what end this would serve? Can we believe that God would proceed to fight against Himself, and not against the devil? Can we receive it that God could attack what is emphatically *His own*, instead of the *devil's work*, in order to *its* destruction? If the body of Christ had not been our body, having the natural proclivity of our body, and the predisposition which belongs to our body, then so far as I can see, there had been in Him nothing to be sacrificed, because there could have been nothing to be remedied—nothing

Digitized by Google

to be removed. And if there had been nothing to be remedied or removed, it were impossible that sin could by Him be taken away!

How little understanding have we in the divine economy, when we can allow ourselves to view the sacrifice of Christ as if it were God rising in indignation against Himself, and laying violent hands on His own all-perfect work,—as if God were thus, in fact, "divided against Himself," and taking pleasure in breaking down the very work (pure and perfect) of His own hands. This, we may be sure, cannot be. What, however, we do see in Christ is the Immaculate One taking on the burden of *our* flesh and blood, that there might be no escape from *its* being sacrificed—no escape from *its* meeting the opposition and the collision, and the discomfiture and the death which are essential, in order to the entire destruction of its dominion, as a power striving for rule in the soul; and no escape, therefore, in order to the prevention of all those terrible evils which its unrestrained licentiousness created in the souls and lives of men. In offering up His body as He did, He *initiated that new and living way* of making atonement to God, the utilization of which the Redeeming Spirit alone can achieve, by the application of the process unto us, in which case we are ourselves "made kings and priests to God". The mystical body of Christ must go through the same process, as has already been effected in the Founder: the members must be partakers with the Head.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS VIII.

ON CHRIST BEING AT ONCE THE PRIEST AND VICTIM.

It is remarkable how fully and accurately the word of God corroborates and confirms the views which have been herein propounded; and in cases where our authorised version fails to give a fair grammatical sense of the original. In Heb. ix. 12, our authorised version has these words, "by *His own* blood (not by *ours*, which He *had* sacrificed), He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*". In the original the words are as follow: διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδιου αἵματος, εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰώνιαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. It is to the last clause I particularly wish to direct attention. The first clause is no doubt very important, as indicating that it was not generally what might be termed the blood which belonged to Himself, τὸ αἷμα ἑαυτοῦ for He had made *our* blood a part of Himself but τὸ αἷμα το ἴδιον, *His own proper and peculiar blood* which was essentially and intrinsically His own blood,—that which belonged to His own spirit-body, and which He carried into the Holy Sanctuary, as the life-substance of His spiritual nature, as distinguished from "the blood of the cross" which was poured out and sacrificed in the de-

Digitized by Google

struction of the body of the flesh; but what applies to my present argument is the expression which follows, as attesting what the death on the cross had actually accomplished. The expression is αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. Surely grammatical accuracy forbids here the interpolation of the words ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. *No MS. whatever contains them;* and the very term employed (εὑράμενος) forbids the possibility of such interpolation. Yet our translators, not content with the translation "having obtained eternal redemption," have without any authority whatever and assuredly in the teeth of the passage, as it must be grammatically rendered, inserted the words "for us". I question not for a single moment that it was *for us*, that is with a view to *our* salvation, that Christ Jesus came into our world and took upon Him our nature, and suffered and died; I believe that this was the *end*, for the accomplishment of which He appeared, and that He fulfilled the work given Him to do. But what I say is, that, in order to the fulfilment of this ultimate object and purpose, the immediate and direct achievement of Christ was to lay that foundation, without which His end could not be obtained; and that foundation was the redemption of the human body (as being *our* body) which He had assumed; and hence the expression εὑράμενος "*having obtained for Himself*," an expression peculiarly remarkable in the circumstances, and one which without some very important teaching, could not have been permitted in such a passage as this. The verb εὑρίσκω signifies *to find*, it may be casually without special seeking, as when one happens to light upon an object (Ac. ix. 33), or it may be through direct and positive inquiry (Mat. vii. 7), but no one will dispute that the middle voice signifies

Digitized by Google

to *find for one's self*, that is *personally to acquire* something. And this meaning is the more observable in that the passage now quoted is the only one in the New Testament where the verb εὑρίσκω is found in the middle voice. There are not a few passages where this verb, as found in the *active voice*, must needs imply to get or obtain *for self*, such as Luke ix. 12, John xxi. 6, Rom. iv. 1, Heb. xii. 17, Rev. ix. 6, and xviii. 14, in which passages the context makes it obvious that the *finding* must be for *self*. Here, however, is a passage which, because without fail the active voice would have left it to be inferred that the finding was directly and exclusively for *others*, care has been taken to eschew the active voice, and to employ the middle voice, whereby the finding is emphatically declared to be directly for *himself*. The inspired writer, as if to put the question beyond the range of misconception or cavil, employs the middle voice, as indicating the laying of that foundation of redemption in His own person, of which we must become partakers with Him, as "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ," He being the pattern-man, on whom the *deliverance* had to be absolutely achieved, —deliverance from those assaults and temptations whereby He was beset, but that now after the hardest conflict to which it was possible to subject Him, He had come off victorious, as having procured for Himself that absolute λυτρώσις or deliverance or redemption, which consisted in the separation from Him of every disturber of the spiritual life, *i.e.*, of the spiritualised soul,—involving a death which is properly regarded as the ransom-price which the integrity of God demanded, and therefore as the αἰωνίος λύτρωσις, the deliverance during the ages, from the return of the dominion of the

Digitized by Google

flesh, as the power of sin in the soul.[1] The plain English of all this is, that Christ, taking our flesh and blood, took that which carried with it the assaults of the lower nature,—assaults which troubled the soul, and which therefore fought against the soul. But these assaults were the very production or resultants of the devil's work on man, and it was for the express purpose of destroying the devil's work that Christ appeared on the stage of this world.

Christ, then, as the Head of a renewed humanity, "bruised the head of the serpent," in that He perfectly, by death, destroyed the work of the devil in the flesh; and without doubt in this process, the serpent managed to "bruise his heel": yes! when he was nailed to the tree. In the whole process in which Christ was involved, He was at once *the priest and the victim*—the *priest* in that He was in perfect harmony with God, ministering to God, acting as the servant of God, zealous for the glory of God; yea, that all that was offensive to God might be taken out of the way; and the *victim* as pouncing upon the precise object wherein sin had its seat, that it might be mortified, sacrificed, and slain. The priest and the victim are not to be confounded as one and the same. The priest was the *inner man*, allied to God, under the influence of the Divine Spirit: the victim was the *outer*

[1] The self-same argument is supported by the words in Heb. i. 3, καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος, ἐκάθισεν κ. τ. λ., "having made for Himself a purification of sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high". The purification was obviously the grounds on which alone fundamentally He could so sit, and without which He could not hold that position. He must fulfil the work given Him to do, in order to His exaltation, and He did so effectually.

Digitized by Google

man, allied to our humanity, and subjected to the influences of the world, and under those influences harassing and vexing the soul. What men saw of Christ was little more than the outer manhood, and this Christ not unfrequently employs to express *His* personation. Indeed it would have been very difficult to separate the outward man under any circumstances from a prominent share in His personality; for this is the encasement, by which man is not only known to man, but which, as we have seen, supplies its portion of the *me* in the inner man; but Christ in the inner man had what ordinary man has not, the divine nature as sharing in that personality, and this divine nature throwing its halo on the soul of Christ, so that no sinful impulse or influence should have its harbourage or encouragement for a moment there. While, therefore, through the Eternal Spirit He was one with God, He had that notwithstanding which demanded a resolute and inexorable immolation, as the true representative of man. The immolation was made, and the sacrifice was complete under the Divine requirement.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS IX.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTATION.

THE doctrine of sin, as touching the person of the Lord Jesus, has without doubt been one of the most puzzling and perplexing problems with which the Church has had to grapple. Theologians have found themselves either on Scylla or in Charybdis; and the question has been, how to steer clear of both. Either they have been obliged to entertain as truth what logically comes to be a "legal fiction," and therefore having no real foundation; or to ascribe sin to the Lord Jesus, from the ascription of which to Him, in the face of several texts of Scripture attesting His sinlessness, and His acknowledged relationship to God the Father, they have instinctively recoiled. It is believed that the difficulty is increased by the fact, that we are not sufficiently instructed with respect to the source or primary basis of sin, and the precise character of sin, as it affects the human soul fundamentally. This forms the subject of special discussion in the chapter on the Nature and Origin of Sin; and here, therefore, my remarks will have regard chiefly to the interpretation put upon the word "imputation".

Many have got hold of an interpretation to the word

Digitized by Google

imputation for which, so far as I know, there is no real authorisation in Scripture—an interpretation which says, *a thing may be ascribed to us as ours, which after all has never been actually imparted to us.* Such kind of imputation, that is, imputation without impartation, that is, *putative* without being *applicative*, I cannot help regarding as contradictory at once both to reason and to Scripture: indeed, so far as regards our Justification, when the righteousness of Christ is said to be "imputed to us," imputation, without impartation, is subversive of faith! For, what is faith? Faith in a principle is *the receiving of the principle as true;* and if we receive any statement into our hearts *as true*, we are able to *rely* upon it accordingly. But *receiving* aught into our hearts implies of necessity the *impartation* of it into our hearts! If, therefore, justification come by faith, as we are assured it does, it comes *by the impartation to our souls of the truth* as it is in Jesus; and hence, of course, *the imputation.* We are counted righteous on account of our faith; that is, we are counted righteous because of the operation of *receiving:* receiving what? I answer, *the righteousness of Christ:* that is, we have the *imputation* of the righteousness of Christ, because we have the *impartation* of the righteousness of Christ: in short, the two cannot by possibility be separated. The impartation is *a work done in us*, and the imputation is *a declaration of our state* in connection with that work. Hence the connection betwixt Justification and Sanctification, which two our Church tells us are inseparable. The connection must be inseparable: the one cannot be before the other; and the reason is, that the one is a fact arising out of our faith, and the other is God's pronouncement on the condition which faith

Digitized by Google

brings. There never could have been any disputation on this point, if due attention had always been given to the nature of Faith. If the definition of faith given in our Confession and Catechisms had been duly considered, the whole question had come to be settled irrevocably. Faith in Jesus Christ is said to be "*receiving* Christ, and *resting* upon Him". If, then, faith in Christ be the *receiving* of Christ and *resting* upon Him, hence "Christ is *in* us" when we believe; and we have good authority for saying that "*Christ in us* is the hope of glory". This is one side of the great question of imputation: it is the imputation which represents *our relationship to Jesus Christ*, for it is imputation to us of the *righteousness* of Christ, when the same has been *received* by faith.

Now how is it with regard to Jesus Christ our blessed Redeemer as touching the imputation which represents *His relationship to us*, and to Whom, it is allowed, there is the imputation of *our sin?* According to what has just been advanced, if there be properly the *imputation* of our sin to Him, there must needs be the *impartation* of our sin to Him. Here then the question arises:— In what way could there have been the impartation of our sin to One, Who is pronounced to have been "holy, harmless, and undefiled, and separate from sinners," and Who could in triumph ask of the Jews, "Which of you convinceth (or rather convicteth) me of sin?" And in common reason we must admit, that so far as His every act is handed down and rehearsed to us, there is obviously therein an antagonism to sin, and a repudiation of sin. In what way then can we suppose sin imparted to Jesus. We answer at once in no other way than by the fact that our body was imparted to Him:

Digitized by Google

He was "made flesh": He came "in the likeness of sinful flesh,"—in that flesh which has "the law of sin in its members"; and He so came that He might "abolish the enmity in his flesh" (Eph. ii. 14).

I have already touched on this point, and I shall doubtless have occasion to touch upon it again; for it will have to be sifted well, and tested carefully by the inspired word, before its general admission as an article of faith, so that we can truly pronounce Jesus Christ as "*made sin*," while at the same time we are made to know that He was essentially and inherently "*without sin*". The problem has its solution as an interpretation of Scripture, only through a sound understanding of the philosophy of mind. The prominent difficulty is a logical one: How can a thing be and not be at the same time? How can Jesus be *made sin*, and therefore have sin, and at the same time have *no sin?* As a simple proposition the statement is a contradiction in terms; and therefore, as a simple proposition, applicable in each case to the self-same object, or self-same point of the object, it is utterly impossible to receive it. The first law of reason is that of *non-contradiction:* that is, a thing cannot be the opposite or contrary of what it is. It is obvious then, in order to understand the Scripture-statement, that the precise something, which is called *sin*, is not the self-same something, which is said to be *without sin.* And yet in each case, the one and also the other are comprehended under the *He*, or *personality* of Christ. I have said that the element of sin has its primary foundation for man, in the body of the flesh, which he acquires by ordinary generation. Now, as the body is the outward part of human personality, the part indeed which, in the case of every thing that

Digitized by Google

exists, constitutes the foundation of its individuality, it is not to be wondered at, when the body of Christ happens to be referred to, it should be spoken of as *Himself;* and yet it is *not Himself* in the same significance and intensity as the inward and conscious *Me*, the *thinking self.* But we can perfectly understand (for this is part of our own experience) that impulses will in circumstances arise in the body, and be thence presented to the mind, which, if yielded to, would tend to sin, but which are no sooner presented, than they are abhorred and repudiated and crushed by the will. In these circumstances the body of the flesh is said, and properly said, to be *the body of sin*, while *the soul in the circumstances is entirely without sin.* In these circumstances "the soul, that is born of God, cannot sin": *it cannot sin*, because it is under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost. This ought to explain the position in which Christ stood, as well as the work given Him to do.

But here was quite a special case, as compared with that of ordinary man. Going upon the lines of holy Scripture, we are able to explain what at first blush seems an inconsistency and a contradiction; and to expound the same in perfect harmony with actual experiences and scientific conclusions. We have in ourselves as Christians, impulses of a questionable sort, which are immediately put down—impulses of which the outside world knows nothing,—impulses, the very existence of which is not perceived by others; how fully might such experience be in the person of Jesus. There is hardly an incident in His life which does not fairly indicate the process now referred to.

That the soul of Jesus was assailed by a twofold

Digitized by Google

impress, one that had to be suppressed, and one whose law was to operate as the suppressor, cannot we think be questioned for a moment:—On the one side, impulses arose from the flesh, and from the world, as well as from the devil, and the repression of them constituted the cross which, as man, He had to undergo, while alive upon the earth. On the other side, as these instigations appeared, there arose the ever-watchful guardian, suppressing and crushing all such impulses or cravings as would lead into sin, while the same watchful guardian was ever present to instigate the fulfilment of all duty in observing the requirements of God. In this way all incitements from the devil, the world and the flesh ceased, or had no possible influence upon His soul; and finally the flesh itself, through which all other temptation must come, was absolutely sacrificed upon the tree, as the climax and the close of the trials He had to undergo. Thus it becomes obvious, how it came to pass, that the very death which outwardly seemed the hour of His greatest weakness, was literally the hour of His greatest triumph, as manifesting the entire supremacy of the Spirit on His soul.

Here then we have exhibited, in the person of Jesus, that power, which rendered His heart antagonistic to the dominion of the flesh, as being the source of sin upon the soul, while yet He was tempted in *all* points like as we are. Possessed as He was of the divine nature, and that without any sparingness or stintedness of measure, He was enabled to show forth the human soul as absolutely emancipated from any sort of thraldom to the flesh, and always and invariably on the side of God, as the adversary of sin. There was "enmity in His *flesh*"—enmity to the law of the spirit of a pure

Digitized by Google

and holy life—enmity through which the devil and the world worked and pushed their proposals; but His soul was so thoroughly purged of all alliance with that enmity, so as to be in no sense *particeps criminis*, but rather to be its foe and assailant, and with such entire effect, that the life of the flesh, as sinful flesh (and it was sinful only when it sought dominion in the soul), came to be absolutely sacrificed and destroyed—so destroyed that ultimately Christ could say:—"The prince of the world cometh, and hath nothing in Me"—nothing on which he could lay hold in order to further his schemes. Christ thus "sanctified" that humanity of ours which He assumed; and He became "perfected". He brought upon the stage of the world that new manhood, which God from the beginning desiderated, which was the ideal of God, and which perfectly satisfied God, as the entire fulfilment of that ideal; and He brought this about in the exercise of the fair and full freedom of law. It would, as we have noted, have been an easy thing for God, as a matter of mere power, to have taken up the handiwork of Satan, and to have dashed it in pieces, and to have recreated man afresh; but it was not for God to operate otherwise than in perfect conformity with His own law of perfect freedom, as the prerogative of the creature. What then was the work of God in the circumstances? The work of God in the circumstances was to supply a sufficiency of the divine motive to fulfil the end demanded. He offered it to man after the fall; but "the natural man would not receive it". What then? He planted this law in all its plenitude in the bosom of the Son of Man, and *in His person* the contest was allowed to go on; and accordingly the battle of the flesh and of the Spirit was

Digitized by Google

fought *in the person* of Christ; and this to the utter discomfiture of the former, and the absolute victory of the latter. Thus it came to pass that Christ "made sin," *i.e.*, Christ, "after the flesh," became, through the process of Christ's sacrifice, Christ having "sin put away," *i.e.*, "no longer after the flesh". In this way, it obviously comes out, that while Christ had on Him the burden of sin, He could not at any moment be regarded as sinful, but essentially and inherently the very reverse. He had a warfare to enter upon, and a victory to achieve—a warfare that involved this, *viz.*, that the assaults of sin should be brought to bear upon Him, as they are brought to bear upon us, He being made one of ourselves, and "tempted like as we are"; and if so, of course tempted *by the flesh*, as well as *by the world*, and *by the devil*, yet in His case, "without sin": that is, the temptations were in all cases successfully disclaimed and adjured, and came to nought. Christ had in His soul that which enabled Him to resist and to throw back every impulse to sin, for His soul was completely under the sway of the Eternal Spirit, and therefore was maintained in perfect purity throughout.

Thus, then, in the case of Jesus Christ, imputation and impartation are inseparable; and because of the impartation, there was *the imputation of our sin to Christ;* and the explanation of the peculiarity of there being *sin* and yet *no sin*, is understood in that He having and holding the Divine Spirit was enabled to destroy or sacrifice that carnal influence, which, even in His case, sought to have an ascendancy in His soul. That carnal life He destroyed perfectly in the discipline which He maintained over Himself, amid the various

Digitized by Google

provocations to which He was subjected in the world; and this in the exercise of His own priestly office, as "inaugurating a new and a living way" for men—for men to adopt and to apply for their own salvation, and thus and hereby "He finished" to the entire satisfaction of the Father, the work given Him to do, as the foundation on which alone salvation was possible. From that cruelest of tortures to His sensitive frame, we have seen He fain would have escaped, as these were *in no way essential* to the perfection of His obedience; but seeing it behoved that *death must be where sin has been*, and death in its most absolute, as well as relative form, in order to its absolute destruction; and seeing that the devil had contrived at the last, the most grievous and repulsive of deaths, in order, if possible, by intimidation to create consternation and retreat in Christ, and consequently to overawe Him from facing that dreadful ordeal, which in the nature of things, as mere torture, was not *essentially* required for the fulfilment of His mission, but which yet would have been a triumph to Satan (as after all an yielding to the cry of the flesh to be saved), had Christ declined this test of the devil's introduction; and seeing that the Father refused to interfere in the contest which had already been so successfully waged with Satan, Christ submitted to the dreaded cruelty imposed by the powers of darkness, and so He repressed the cry of the flesh to be spared from the agony which awaited it. This last exhibition therefore of the obedience of Christ, was the most remarkable of all, in so far as the cruelty inflicted was not a cruelty directly from the hands of the Father, for that hour was emphatically "the hour of Satan" and his emissaries; and the alternative was, that, if Christ

Digitized by Google

flinched from encountering that hour, it behoved that He had at length hearkened to the cry of the flesh in saving it from death. That must not be in Christ's case; and however fearful the accessories of cruelty by which the final death of the flesh was attended, Christ rather than that in any sense he should be the servant of that which it behoved the Spirit always to control, rendered up the body of the flesh in sacrifice, under the most horrible and hateful agonies,—thus ending by a climax of sublime submission, a career not only unparalleled, but unapproached in the annals of the world, by the utter abnegation of all that is purely human in maintaining the law of the Divine Spirit in opposition to the Evil One.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS X.

ON CHRIST MADE UNDER THE LAW.

GALATIANS iv. 4 says, "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law". The clause "made of a woman" is a strong statement, as to the nature of the Incarnation; and so also is the collateral expression, "made under the law": when duly considered, this latter is a still stronger statement, if possible, touching this all-important question of the Incarnation. As to the former clause, there is not a word uttered having reference to any peculiarity attachable to the woman, as if in any way she had shared flesh and blood different from other women; but the contrary must be inferred; for the generic term "woman" is employed as indicating Christ's bodily derivation from *a female of our common humanity*. We have no alternative, therefore, but to understand that, though by miraculous interposition a basis was laid in the womb of the virgin, forming the rudiment of a man-child, the fœtus must have been unmistakably nourished by the blood-substance which belonged to, and which pervaded, the woman's body. Nor is it questioned that Jesus was made of the self-same substance as the mother of whom He was born—a conclusion not easily evaded, when it is understood as by express revelation, that the primitive germ was "the

Digitized by Google

seed of the woman," and that the blood flowing in the veins of the woman's body, and which went to nourish the woman's own body, was the self-same blood which went to nourish the body of the child Jesus, and which therefore contributed to build up *His* frame, and which, of course, constituted the very flesh and blood of that frame.

The clause "made under the law" confirms very strongly this view of the body of Christ. A natural question here to ask is: Under what law was Christ placed when made man? There can be but one alternative in the reply: it must have been either under *the law of Moses*, or under *the law of the flesh*. That Christ was born under the law of Moses is acknowledged on all hands. Born of Jewish parents, and acknowledged by them, He was, as a matter of course, placed under the Jewish Covenant: hence He had to submit to the ordinance of circumcision, as the token of the Jewish Covenant, and there was no warning or instruction from Heaven against this; and while the true interpretation of that token was a cutting off of the foreskin, as symbolic of the *cutting off* of the power and authority of the flesh, as a ruling power in the soul, it engaged to a close adherence to Jewish ordinances and ceremonies, as instituted by the instrumentality of Moses. Taking then the meaning of the expression, "born under the law," as being born in subjection to the law of Moses—a meaning generally allowed—let us see what this fact of necessity implies. We ask *for whom* was the law of Moses written and revealed? For whom was it ordained? Was it not for those who are born under the law of the flesh? We think there can be no doubt on this point. The law of the flesh is proclaimed

Digitized by Google

to be "the law of sin which is in the members" of the body. The law of the flesh is that impulse or craving which, in our connection with the world, is continually striving for some gratification or another—some indulgence thereto, which the world can supply. The law of the flesh, therefore, for want of any counteracting law, has become the law of sin, the law which rules in ordinary man, to the breeding of much spiritual guilt. The law of Moses, as *moral*, was directly antagonistic to the law of the *flesh*. The law of Moses, as moral, had its foundation in the bosom of God; and the ceremonial law was but accessory instrumentality, whereby the moral law might best be answered and obeyed. The moral law said to the law of the flesh, "Thou shalt not"; and hence *thou-shalt-not* is the one grand injunction applicable to every sin specified in the decalogue—applicable, therefore, to all those appetites and desires—to all those impulses and passions which have their foundation in the flesh, and which lead men to sin, and which succeed in inducing ordinary men to commit sin; that is, where ordinary men have not the power of the Spirit of God given to them to curb these and to restrain them from sin.

If such was the law of Moses, then, how could Jesus Christ be said to be "made under the law" of Moses? I answer, this could not have been, if there had been no influences on Him, *i.e.*, no impulses from the flesh to commit sin: in that case, the law of Moses had not, and could not, by any rational interpretation, have had any application to Him. If there was in Christ nothing common with ordinary man, as touching inducements or influences to sin, then assuredly the "thou shalt not," as proclaimed to others, could have had no re-

Digitized by Google

ference to Him! But if we say that He was tempted *in all respects* as other men are—if we say that He was subjected to the play and provocations which come from the flesh, and to those incitements which come from the world, and which bring ordinary men into sin, and which when conceived, and harboured, and indulged, constitute the sins fundamentally of ordinary man, then of course the prohibitions of Moses' law were applicable to Him!

And did not Christ fulfil that law? Nay! did He not honour that law? And did He not honour, in the most conspicuous fashion, the law under which God made man at the first? The law under which God made man at the first was the moral law, supported by the special commands of God, which came with the authority of God. Christ obeyed all, under the most trying circumstances! But how could He be said to have fulfilled the law in all its demands, if He had not been made subject to the challenge of that law? And how could He have been made subject to the law, if there was no temptation brought to bear upon Him to break the law? If Jesus had not been troubled by temptations like other men, and amenable to the force of these temptations, and consequently if Jesus had not had a contest to engage in, a struggle to encounter, between opposing influences—if Jesus had not had a very difficult work to do, which required the most determined courage to overcome, then what means His incarnation, and what means His temptation in the wilderness, and what means the self-denials of His life, in leaving home, in opposing the world, in declining all its offers, in withstanding the powers that be, in permitting His body to be nailed to the tree, rather than

Digitized by Google

that the law of the flesh should in any sense rule over Him? Is not Christ the fulfilment of the very ends of the law, in its most minute requirements? In the case of other men, they had recourse to the prescribed sacrifices and offerings which were the provision of the law as temporary expedients, "which could never make the corners thereto perfect as pertaining to the conscience"; but "He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself".

There are several additional considerations which may be referred to as proofs that Christ was "made under the law". I have already spoken of His circumcision, which made *Him* "a debtor to do the whole law" (Galatians v. 3), and, consequently, to fulfil the moral and ceremonial obligations of the Levitical dispensation, though He put Himself actually in the place of these. I might also refer to the *purification* which the mother underwent after child-birth, the same as any other woman in Israel. It may be asked, Could she really be defiled by the act of giving birth to "the holy child, Jesus"? Surely not, if His flesh was not in all respects *our* flesh. But Mary submitted to be "unclean for seven days," just as Jesus submitted to be presented for circumcision on the eighth day, according to Leviticus xii. 2, 3. And again, Mary "continued in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days, touching no hallowed thing, nor coming into the sanctuary until the days of her purifying were fulfilled"; for Luke tells us that "when the days of *her purification* were accomplished *according to the law of Moses*, they brought Him to Jerusalem to present Him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord), and to offer

Digitized by Google

a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle doves and two young pigeons" (Luke ii. 22-24, Lev. xii. 11). No distinction whatever is admitted whereby Mary and her Son could be exempted from the requirements of the law, as making its demands on sin-born humanity.

But again, our blessed Lord Himself gave further illustration of His conformity to the law, as one "made under the law," by *submitting to the baptism of John*, just as any other devout Israelite at the time. It is said that "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about went out to John, and were baptised of him in Jordan, confessing their sins". "Then (it is added) cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to be baptised of him." What was the very nature of John's baptism? We are expressly told that it was "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins". How could Jesus submit to this baptism? No wonder that John forbade Him, saying: "I have need to be baptised of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" Yet the Saviour, who saw more deeply into the question than John, insisted on the propriety of this step; and indeed on the duty of this step, and He made the distinct and imperative reply, saying: "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to *fulfil all righteousness*". Righteousness was involved in the fulfilment of this requirement. What righteousness could it be? What, surely, but the righteousness which demanded that solemn dedication to God which was required as implying the engagement to wash away all sin.

The washing away of sin in ordinary man cometh by his being bathed in the blood of atonement: that is, in the blood of God, which cleanseth from all sin: that is,

Digitized by Google

"the law of the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, frees from the law of sin and death"; and in ordinary man, this is effected in and through the process of repentance, whereby men are separated from their sins, or more strictly, whereby sins are separated from the souls of men. But the sins whereby Jesus was beset, were not from the soul; nor were they sins of the soul in His case, but from the body only: they pertained to the flesh; and so, while there could literally be no repentance, strictly so called, in Christ, He had yet to "strip Himself" of those pressing agencies whereby He was beset; and therefore He came with others to the baptism of John. Thus He exhibited, by another public act, His strict conformity to the law, that law which, we have already noticed, was most rigorous and severe against sin, and which demanded the unsparing chastisement of sin.

There is another example of conformity to the law, which implies more than is usually understood by it: I refer to the payment of "the tribute-money". What was the tribute-money? We learn this from Ex. xxx. 11-16. We are told it was "a ransom for the soul," —"an offering to the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls,"—"the atonement-money of the children of Israel, for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, a memorial unto the children of Israel before the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls". The sum was half a shekel or ten gerahs. "Every one that passeth among them that are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give an offering unto the Lord. The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than half a shekel." The tribute-money was instituted to be gathered, when a census of the

Digitized by Google

people should be taken; but as Josephus intimates, it was in his time paid annually by *all* males, from twenty years old and above, a circumstance rendered necessary by the great expenses of the temple and of the temple-services, and possibly also by reason of the Roman taxes. Looking then to the life of Jesus, it may be asked why should *He* pay "atonement-money"; we can only answer by replying that as the law demanded that the body of sin should be slain, so accordingly Jesus paid the customary contribution for this end when demanded; thus manifesting His entire conformity to Mosaic institutions, and confessing His real character as "made under the law" by the fact that He was born in the flesh, and as man, therefore subject to its assaults.

Much might be said on the careful observance by Christ of the ceremonial of the law, and consequently of His taking to Himself an application of the sentiment which the ceremonial implied. "Three times in the year (said the statute) all thy males shall appear before the Lord God." Accordingly our Lord's attendance at the feasts of the Passover, of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles, is carefully recorded. Let us for a moment regard but one of these—His attendance at the Passover. The Passover was not a purely commemorative service. It demanded the literal sacrifice of a paschal lamb, as a representative of death for sin; and carrying home therefore to the celebrators of the paschal service, the necessity of sin being slain. Christ "kept that feast"; and thereby He applied to Himself the lesson which was prescribed by such a ceremonial: and not only this, but He became Himself in all verity "the Paschal Lamb" as one amenable to the law, and fulfilling the law in its deepest requirements. The offering of vic-

Digitized by Google

tims could go but a very little way to touch the evil, whereby man was beset; and accordingly "the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did". "What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (as being strong in opposing it), God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as touching sin, condemned sin in the flesh." In this way Christ was subject to the law, and fulfilled the law: he honoured and established the law.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XI.

ON THE NATURE OF ATONEMENT.

I CANNOT omit an opportunity of repeating and pressing the real points in the great and all-absorbing question of Atonement. No greater damage has ever been done to the Church of Christ than to misconceive the language of Holy Writ on the grand theme of the priesthood of Christ. The doctrine of atonement (it is true) has been held, held firmly, by the orthodox, as it has been proclaimed unambiguously in our formularies; yet, with all the efforts at exposition of this central theme, that doctrine (it must be confessed) continues beclouded by tremendous difficulties to this day. True, it is not the part of Confessions, Creeds, or Articles of Faith, to expound difficulties in Scripture, but only to detail the doctrines as facts in due and orderly connection; and it is the part of sermons and treatises on Scripture-subjects to do all that in man lies to explain them as in consistency with Scripture, and with the best instruction which our rational intelligence has received; but it will hardly be questioned that much remains yet to be done for this theme in order to justify the plan of God, and to simplify the ways of God to man.

Digitized by Google

But what is the reason of the difficulties by which this doctrine of atonement is beset? It lies in our failure to analyze the person of our Lord Jesus, Who became flesh, even our flesh; and in our failure to see that in *our flesh lies the foundation and source of human sin.* So soon as we are able to point to the origin of evil in our souls, and so soon as we are able to see that Christ did verily assail and destroy the evil in its roots, the subject of atonement will not only stand forth as a scriptural principle, but will be confirmed as a scientific fact. The difficulty respecting atonement is no doubt a psychological one fundamentally, in as far as psychology has yet failed to pronounce *how*, or in what way it is, that the body of the flesh affects our souls, and consequently it has been unable to say in what way the flesh goes to stain and defile our souls with sin. I shall have to enter into a discussion of this question before closing this inquiry, and therefore I cannot here take it up. I simply *here* take two things for granted. First, that *the body does affect the soul*, in so far as we are conscious of the states of our body, conscious of injuries thereto and of pains therein, when it is hurt,—conscious of pleasure when it is gratified,—conscious of impulses when the body has cravings, conscious of impressions of every kind when these are conveyed through the senses to our souls. Second, that *each soul is characterised by its own body*, in its dispositions and cravings, in every case of ordinary manhood; and hence that all mankind by ordinary generation are radically constituted *carnal* from the very beginning of their being. If sin is in the flesh, therefore it follows as a necessary consequence that sin is and must be in the soul of ordinary manhood as begotten of the flesh—begotten, I say, on

Digitized by Google

the intellectual ground common to all living creatures, begotten in each case precisely according to that bodily system which has its own proper individuality; and as thus begotten, so structured as to present the phenomenon of the particular consciousness of that individuality, which has been manifested in the soul.

These two facts are all-important, if we can establish them. That they are agreeable to Scripture, needs not be doubted or questioned for a moment, when it tells us that "in the flesh dwelleth no good thing," that is, *no good, as a governing power for a soul preparing for immortality,* and a dwelling-place with God; for the flesh is only for a material state, and must needs *per se* partake of the selfishness of a material state; and the Scriptures without doubt pronounce the material complexion of the human soul in its fallen condition, as "carnal". That they are agreeable to the fundamental teaching of the Church, needs not be doubted, when it so emphatically proclaims the propagation of the fallen state to be through "ordinary generation," in virtue of which man is regarded as having lost the Spirit of God, and consequently lost the image of God, and consequently as having become the very creature of the carnal man. Man, born in this condition, is of necessity born in sin, that is, in a state in which he cannot please God, as one preparing for immortality; and not only this, but in which, as being without the Spirit, there is in him no sufficiently controlling power to restrain his sin-ward course.

In these circumstances, the Lord Jesus Christ appears in the form of man, and on the stage of human life; and how simple is the statement of the divine record which says—"In all things it behoved Him to be made like

Digitized by Google

unto His brethren, *that* He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in offerings to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people; for in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour those that are tempted". What have we here? We have just been made aware by the chapter, that "He who made the world," He who is "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His Person, and upholding all things by the word of His power," was made man: by which we understand—not that the divine nature gave up (if it could give up) any of its proper or essential characteristics as God, much less could as such be confined within the limits of a human frame, but that "the form of God" as involving the mind of God, and embracing the righteousness of God, was so appropriated and adjusted, as to become the foundation on which manhood might be engrafted; and so engrafted that in one personality there should be two distinct natures:—the human nature characterised by its derivation from the human body; and the divine nature, in the background so to speak, yet in truth, side by side therewith, and operating thereon, as need required. The divine nature in Him is to be regarded as one and the same with the Eternal Spirit, giving development to His human soul in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, so that the soul expanded as the body grew: that soul being subjected to the impulses, cravings and various affections which of necessity belong to the body, and which thus equipped it had to control. It must be obvious then that there behoved to be in Christ a collision betwixt two opposite influences, and that a contest must inevitably transpire in His bosom. He was temptible in respect of the lower part of His being,

Digitized by Google

and He was accordingly tempted; and He felt the power and force of temptations, whether coming from the devil, or from the world, or from the flesh; but He never succumbed to temptation; in as far as He was supported by another and superior power, whose influence was always more efficacious than the influence which came from the sensuous source, and He was thereby enabled to "abolish the enmity in His flesh" (Eph. ii. 15), and thus to "condemn sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3).

We see then in Christ, what constituted priesthood: we see what was properly the priest and what was properly the victim. These two are not to be confounded: the priest is one thing, and the victim is another; and this of necessity. If Christ had not been in possession of "the Eternal Spirit" as clothing His soul, He could not have been a priest; and if He had not been incarnated in our human body, He could not have been the victim. Christ therefore cast out, that is He sacrificed, what was sin, as coming from the body of the flesh, and finally and physically, "He was put to death therein"; and this He fulfilled by the power which belonged to Him as the eternal Son of God. In this way, then, Christ brought in a new manhood, a manhood wherein the flesh was dethroned from all power over the soul, and performed only a secondary part, in that, having no ruling power in the soul, it was the servant of the Spirit, and therefore the servant of righteousness:—hence a manhood entirely governed by the Spirit, a manhood in harmony with God, having therein the righteousness of God, and therefore wholly acceptable to God, as the true manhood, destined by God for the celestial life of a happy immortality. In this way

Digitized by Google

then we ought clearly to see how Christ "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself".

But we may be told that the reconciliation of Christ was *not a personal matter with Himself;* and the text I have quoted from Heb. ii. 17, 18, may be once more referred to, as saying that the priesthood of Christ "in things pertaining to God," was designed "*to make reconciliation for the sins of the people*". Assuredly this was the great aim and final end of Christ's incarnation. Had not this been the purpose to be effected, Christ would not have been "made flesh"; but who sees not that, *in order to effect this great end,* it behoved Him to lay the foundation of reconciliation *in Himself,* so as to make God and man to be absolutely *at one in Himself.* Are we not told that He "abolished the enmity in His flesh, that He might create in Himself, as to the twain, one new man, so making peace?" (Eph. ii. 15.) Christ thus became the second Adam, through whom and from whom a new and true manhood might be propagated in the world, to lay the foundation of reconciliation in Himself. It has to be noted that Christ now exercises His priesthood in our behalf: He must do so in order to our Justification. The Apostle tells us that while He died, or was delivered over to death, διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, *on account of our offences,* which he bore; *i.e., through* or *by reason of* the human offences that are grounded in the body of the flesh, which in Him, as being *ours,* was put to death; so *He* was raised διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν *by reason of our justification,* that is *through* or *because* of the justification of *our* nature which He, as our head and representative, holding what is *ours,* had received. (Rom. iv. 25.) Had not Christ in His body

Digitized by Google

borne the παραπτώματα which belong to *our* natural living body, and which subjected Him to the curse of the law, He had not been put to death; and had not Christ taken these παραπτώματα entirely out of the way, so that not one offence was to be found on His soul, He had not been justified and therefore raised from the dead. It was *by reason of, i.e., owing to* the justification of His humanity, as our great head and representative, that He was raised to glory.

And this goes a good way to explain our state as related to this condition of Justification. Christ as partaking what is ours could properly have received no justification, if He had not performed the work given Him to do; but He did perform it, and God was satisfied; and therefore it was not possible that He should be holden of death; wherefore as the representative of man, He being justified, was raised from the dead; and this justification is called *ours* because it was the justification of *our* manhood in Him, and therefore the token of human acceptance as *our* representative before God. The delivering over to death, in order to the stamping out of offences, could not but be attended with sufferings; hence it is said that He was tried: He was tried in His soul by the temptations to which He was exposed in the world: He was tried by the offences which came up to His soul, seeking for an asylum there, seeking to be tolerated there, seeking to be cherished there; and He suffered in denying Himself to these, in repudiating these, in slaying and sacrificing these. Now, what is added in the passage quoted? Being Himself tried and having overcome [mark having *overcome*] and being Himself justified, and therefore raised from the dead, "He is able to succour them

Digitized by Google

that are tempted," them that are similarly tried as He was. The relation of the Saviour to sin was, that *He took the burden and shook it off*, though under grievous suffering; the relation in which we sinners stand to the Saviour is this, that He succours us, who are helpless in ourselves, to put away sin. But in order that we may put away sin, and become partakers of His righteousness, He makes us "kings and priests unto God". Apart from this great prerogative of the Spirit, it is impossible for *us* to exercise that priesthood whereby sin is sacrificed, and that kingship of the Spirit, which constitutes the ruling power of God in our souls.

I am perfectly aware that this is not the ordinary way of expounding the atonement effected by our blessed Lord, but it is in every point perfectly consistent with Scripture, and perfectly in harmony with the great principles of atonement laid down in our Church-articles, as the creed which we are asked to receive. The principles of atonement are laid down to us as effected by the Lord Jesus, and by Him alone; the exposition of these principles, as in harmony with Scripture and with reason, is left to the students of God's word; and here we have an exposition defining in terms of Scripture the essential nature of atonement, the grounds on which atonement is accomplished, the process whereby it is effected, and ascribing *all* to the Lord Jesus Christ. Here we have the Lord Jesus Christ set forth in His foundation as God, yet assuming in that foundation our manhood—a manhood bearing the burden of sin, and the trial of our offences, as the very dogmata of the flesh, while the inner man was antagonistic to sin, and, in spite of every effort of Satan to insinuate sin, throwing every inroad of sin aside, and thereby presenting

Digitized by Google

and perfecting a new manhood, wherein the evil introduced by Satan as a part of the human economy came to be utterly abolished, and the righteousness which reigns in the bosom of God to be fully realised. Hence the satisfaction of God is expressed with the regeneration which has been thus accomplished, as "the first fruits" of a glorious redemption.

There is nothing in all this which militates against the glorious scheme of atonement. There can be no regeneration which does not of necessity imply atonement; for regeneration implies recovery or restoration, regeneration is but another word for "effectual calling"; regeneration involves the soul's extrication from the meshes of sin, and its investment with the garniture of righteousness; regeneration, therefore, essentially bespeaks and involves, and signifies, an atonement for sin, as applied to the soul, in as far as an atonement is emphatically the *putting away of sin and the embracing of righteousness*, as the ground of harmony with God, and of satisfaction to God.

It behoved Christ to lay this "foundation" of acceptance. Without it there could not have been, and could not be, "a building" or superstructure of acceptance. When we see how it has been with the foundation, then are we able to see how it is, and should be, with the superstructure. The self-same law of atonement must be applied to the superstructure that has been employed (and employed so successfully) as applicable to the foundation. Now, "other foundation can no man lay, than what is laid, which is Jesus Christ". How this foundation was laid we see, in that He took our body of sin, and in that He offered up this body of sin in sacrifice to God.

Digitized by Google

Here it is that the mind of the Church requires even in this our day to be fairly and fully instructed; to see that Christ took upon Him the very burden of our sin in truth, while yet in truth He was the sinless One. Until the Church comes to see this, and to hold this, it is impossible for her to be in a thoroughly healthy condition. Here is a question then of unspeakable importance, which must be fairly looked at and canvassed, which must be honestly and reverently weighed and considered, which must be boldly met and grappled with. We are, on the one hand, to note that we behold Christ as inwardly, and personally, and essentially the Immaculate and Holy One; yet the Holy One, as man touched and troubled with the assaults of sin, pushing and pressing by every artful course to have its dogmas or principles lodged in His soul, and carried into volition by His will, and it was this load of offences springing from the body of sinful flesh He assumed, which gave to Him the power of exercising priesthood, in as far as He made this body of sin the victim which must be offered up in sacrifice to God.

Had Jesus not taken to Himself this our body of flesh and blood, had He assumed what many mistakingly think that He did assume, a body of flesh and blood which carried in it no emotions for its gratification—a body absolutely and in all respects the same as it came to be through the discipline it had attained at the close—a body in short which contained none of our offences; then would there have been nothing to sacrifice, then would Christ have been incapable of exercising priesthood, because there would, there could, have been nothing to put away, unless (which we cannot suppose) God had put forth His hand to

Digitized by Google

destroy the beauties which are essentially His own, and in harmony with His own holy will. If we consider aright, the possibility of sacrifice must be hereby excluded; for if Christ came with a humanity into the world, which demanded no self-denial and no sacrifice in order to please God, nothing in short of which it had to be "stripped," in order to its being in perfect harmony with God,—no offences of which it had to be purged in order to be "sanctified"; in that case "this man had *nothing* to offer" as a sin-offering unto God. Hence under these circumstances sacrifice was excluded! It was excluded, unless, as I have said, God was motived to assault Himself, to assault what was and is His own, and to destroy His own blessed handiwork; and this, observe, for the sake of putting away sin! How could this put away sin if there were no sin? Can sin be put away where nothing of the sort exists? Here it is that some amazing delusion exists. How by possibility could the destruction or sacrifice of what is righteous put away sin? All becomes cogent, consistent, clear, and convincing, however, if we suppose that the Son of God took to Himself "a true body" of our flesh and blood with all its organisation, and that out of said organisation He had "a reasonable or rational soul" developed with this proviso that said soul was furnished, as need required, with the motive power of the Divine Spirit, that was present thereat. That body, in the circumstances, was to Him the burden of sin, it was the source of offence to the pure and sinless Christ. That body had its connection with, and its dependence on, the world, as our bodies have: it subsisted on the things of the world as our bodies do; it had hunger and thirst

Digitized by Google

and a natural craving for the things of the world even as our bodies have; it was affected by the influences of the world as our bodies are. If you pricked it, it would bleed; if you laid a load upon it, it would be weighed down; if you overtasked that body, it would be wearied. It needed sleep as our bodies do; it was dependent on food and drink for its subsistence like our own; it would shed tears when sorrow arose; it could sweat the moisture of its system, yes! even to blood and water, when agony arose. In all outward respects it was undistinguishable as a human body from that of others; His very brethren could see no difference; the people of the world could see no difference; He Himself proclaimed no difference; the Scriptures indicate no difference. On the contrary, they tell us that as Christ was so are we in this world, and they argue that what happened to His body in resurrection will happen to us. We can understand, therefore, how Christ had a feeling of our infirmities, those infirmities which in *our* case are developed in sin, but in *His* case produced no sin. Having what is ours He could know what befalls sinful man, and could feel a sympathy with our condition; and knowing experimentally what the trials of that condition are, and by what process the sinfulness of that condition is overcome, He could supply and apply the needful remedy for this end. Having borne our burdens and carried our sorrows, He was touched with an experience of our case; and therefore He could from Himself, when perfected, do what was needful in order to redeem, recover, restore, and perfect the body of humanity, as the elect of God, for the everlasting Church of God in eternity.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XII.

ON THE HANDWRITING OF ORDINANCES,

AND ON THE INTERPRETATION OF COL. II. 14, 15.

THIS text (Col. ii. 14, 15) deserves special notice. It has been sadly misunderstood and misinterpreted by commentators; and yet how could it well be otherwise, if the psychological problem had never so much as hinted the grounds on which the soul is affected by the body? How could an accurate understanding of the passage be even dreamt of, if, contrary to the teaching of Paul, no conception had ever been entertained that the flesh contributes the handwriting of sin by which the soul of man is defiled? It would occupy much space to rehearse what expositors have written on this passage. Whitby will have the δόγματα in this passage and in Eph. ii. 15 to mean the *ritual prescriptions* of the ceremonial law, in which interpretation he is joined by the great host of commentators. M'Knight thinks that the δόγματα in this passage refers to the moral precepts, while in the Epistle to Ephesians, in his view, it signifies the ritual precepts of the law of Moses. Olshausen, an acute commentator, is obviously bewildered. Writing on verse 14, he gives a lengthy criticism of the passage, with all the *pros* and *cons*,

Digitized by Google

and alternatives of commentators (too lengthy to be here extracted). His commentary is open, fair and candid; but it can hardly be said to have done much for this remarkable passage of Scripture. Granting that the idea of *debt* is contained in χειρόγραφον as being regarded *the bill* which denotes the debt, we should say there is a wide distinction between the debt and the bill which proclaims the existence of the debt. The bill stands or falls with the debt. If the debt be discharged, there can no longer be any bill of charge. If the debt remains, the bill of charge of course remains. "The wages of sin is death." Our bodies are all of them bodies of sin, in that they are without exception characterised by sinful impulses upon the soul, and without exception they have to die. But if through the sprinkling of the precious blood of Christ, our souls are cleansed from an evil conscience, the bill of condemnation is then, but only then, withdrawn. Regarding sin then as the debt, it is the debt alone which is blotted out; and as a matter of course the charge against the debtor is thereby cancelled or discharged. Without doubt, therefore, the χειρόγραφον refers to that handwriting on the soul which is properly regarded as *sin*, and which, as being sin, is injurious to the soul, and consequently a handwriting *against* or "contrary to" the interests of the soul, and to the wellbeing of the soul. There is therefore no good ground for Olshausen's remark, that if this interpretation were the correct one, it would be said χειρόγραφον ἡμῶν and not καθ' ἡμῶν.

The phrase Ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον, is but a variation and exposition of the phrase immediately going before. The verse immediately preceding stands

Digitized by Google

thus: "And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened *together with Him*" [*i.e.*, as He was quickened]. Mark the source and pathway to this quickening in the Spirit: (χαρισάμενος τὰ παραπτώματα) having given up or remitted, *i.e.*, *freed us from* all trespasses; and this He hath done "by expunging that which is against us, *viz.*, the handwriting in its dogmas, or *assertative claims* as decrees or demands emanating from the uncircumcised flesh. These dogmas or decrees, as demands of the flesh, which are hostile to us, in as far as they make us enemies to God, Christ hath taken away: He hath removed them. How? The Apostle answers, "by that circumcision made without hands which was manifested in the circumcision of Christ," and which he tells us consists "in His putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," that is the sinful dogmata of the body of flesh, or the carnal body which is productive of sins (Col. ii. 11). Surely, then, we can have no doubt as to the meaning of χειρόγραφον. If on the one hand the handwriting of Christ upon our souls makes us to be "epistles of Christ, known and read of all men, ministered by His servants, written not with ink but with the spirit of the living God" (2 Cor. iii. 3), and thereby constituting that soul which is begotten of the Spirit to be *spiritual*, why refuse to receive it, that the handwriting which comes from our uncircumcised flesh, and which, as such, is impressed upon our souls, constitutes the soul to be *carnal*, and therefore as living in the flesh, to be *sinful* and incapable of pleasing God? Here we have another additional assurance that Christ, having taken the body of our flesh, subjected it to the needful circumcision in order to the removal of this autographic

Digitized by Google

power on the part of the flesh—a power which in man constituted man's condemnation, and consequently the expunging of which constituted the taking away of all condemnation of the soul (Rom. viii. 1).

Olshausen thinks there must be "a comprehensive conception of the law in all its relations, in respect to its commanding form, without the faculty of communicating higher power, by which it can kill but not make alive". I believe there is only one law referred to, *viz.*, "the law of members," "the law of sin which is in the members," the law which leadeth to the death of the soul; for "the wages of sin is death". No other law in truth can kill. The voice which proclaims "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," is only the declaration of a law that *can never be blotted out.* Hence (with all possible respect for lofty men of brilliant parts who found themselves shut up to some interpretation or another) *I cannot admit that the law of condemnation against sin could ever be blotted out;* for such a law must ever stand inalienable before God; for that said law nailed Christ to the cross. The cross was a prominent confirmation of the law that death must be awarded to sin. Hence no law directly from God could, by any possibility, be itself nailed to the cross. The moral law could not; for if it be comprehended in this saying, *viz.*, "thou shalt not sin," that law stands imperishable, binding now, and binding for ever. The ceremonial law could not; for it was instituted for a temporary purpose, to serve in the maintenance of those lessons which the moral law prescribed, and could in no proper sense be regarded as a handwriting against man. As well, or much more, might the death of Christ Himself be regarded as a handwriting against man, seeing the

Digitized by Google

death of Christ was the complete fulfilling of the moral law, even as the Mosaic ritual was the external, the partial, or pictorial fulfilling of that law. The Mosaic ritual was not against man, but was an institution for man: for man in his infantine state—enabling him to keep God always before him, and imposing the necessary severities, in order to preserve him from idolatry and other sins hateful to God.

Assuredly that which was against man, and contrary to man's true condition before God, and hostile to his happiness, was *sin;* and it was sin which the Lord Jesus took out of the way; it was sin which He nailed to the cross; it was sin which He absolutely destroyed upon the cross. Sin was in Him slain never to rise again. And when He shall appear the second time, what are we told? We are told "He shall appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 28). Can words be simpler, clearer, stronger? He hath for ever put away sin from the human frame, as the head and representative of a new and regenerated people, by the sacrifice of Himself. And as sin is in so many ways said to have its foundation in the flesh, and as the body of Christ's flesh was nailed to the tree, and that body is expressly said to have been offered up by Him a sacrifice to God and slain, so the cross was but the open or public manifestation of the death of sin, in that it was the last and parting stroke for the utter and effective destruction of that frame in which the foundations of sin had their existence.

That death, indeed, Christ had before practically accomplished in His life; and the climax or the close, which demanded death in its uttermost form, Jesus did not resile from. Jesus resiled only from the

Digitized by Google

cruelties of Calvary: the cruelties of Calvary with all its immediate antecedents, as being introduced by Satan and his agents, He did deprecate: He would have avoided these, as ingredients wholly unnecessary, in the expiatory process He came to fulfil. Only, as the Father would not interpose in the contest which Christ had assumed with Satan, to destroy the work of Satan, but left Him to fight out the battle with Satan, though in that battle He should suffer to the uttermost; so Christ, rather than decline death, though brought upon Him with so many hideous and revolting cruelties, submitted to it under all the venom and vengeance which Satan and his agents were able to instigate.

Olshausen in order to help his view of χειρόγραφον being "a bill which declares the guilt of man on the part of God," refers to several passages of Scripture as if they would support the view which implies *a blotting out of the bill of condemnation against sin!* The first of these is Rom. vii. 9, &c. As this passage is very important, and has been regarded as somewhat difficult of interpretation, it is the more needful to consider it particularly. Let us go back to the 7th verse of that chapter. There we have these words:—"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust [to be sin], except the law had said, thou shalt not covet." Here the term "law" without doubt refers to the *moral law*, by which law, we are elsewhere told, "we have the knowledge of sin," in as far as we are thereby clearly taught that *whatsoever it forbids is sin.* Let us now follow the Apostle as he proceeds in the chapter. "But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence." What can the Apostle here

Digitized by Google

mean by *sin* (which he personifies), as "taking occasion by the commandment and working all manner of concupiscence"? And what can he mean by the *commandment*, as in fact the helper of sin in this tendency of concupiscence? These are important questions. He had just said in the 5th verse that "when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins which were by the law [that is the sinful affections which were by the law of the flesh] did work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death". Have we not here an exposition, then, of verse 8? By "sin" is meant "the flesh," and by "the commandment" is meant "the motion of sin"—what he elsewhere calls δόγμα, that is, the sinful affection by which he was beset, which "motion of sin" he calls the "decree" in the passage from Colossians just considered. Nothing can be more obvious, then, that while the *moral law forbade sin, the carnal law instigated sin*, and the instigation to sin is called "commandment"; and while the Apostle, as representing a common enough case, was under the ruling power of the carnal, he was carried along into all the concupiscence which its δόγματα or commands craved for.

Now let us advance with the Apostle, as exhibiting a person *at one time* confronted by the power of the moral law, and subjected to its restraining influence; and again *at another time* swept along by the carnal law of sin. He goes on, in verse 8, "For without the law, sin was dead; for I was alive without the law once". Paul means to say that there are times when the law of sin is quiescent, when the soul will have aspirations to God, and in that case it would be alive unto God; but he adds, "when the commandment came, sin revived and I died"; that is, when the impulse of the flesh arose (as the δόγμα

Digitized by Google

τῆς ἁμαρτίας), he came to be under its power as a paroxysm he could not withstand, in which case the penitence which carried him to God, during the quiescence of the impulse, and the consequent looking up to God, passed away: he became in these circumstances once more dead to God. It is most true *in every sense* of the term "law," that "without the law sin is dead"; for there is no knowledge of sin without the moral law; but it is obvious that the *law spoken of at this particular point, is not the moral law, but the law of the flesh,* as the instigator of sin. There are times when the law of the flesh is dormant or dead—when it does not prompt to sin; and again times when a vehement craving comes on, which he calls "the commandment"; and then, carried away by the violence of the rising emotion, the sin which before was quiescent or dead came into full manifestation, "sin revived and I died": I died to the moral law, because I was operated on by the carnal impulse as a commanding influence, and I having felt no other as animating me for the time, I became as one dead to God. What then? He goes on to say: "and the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death". How so? The Apostle answers: "For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good." One would at first be almost inclined to think that the Apostle had now come to use the self-same term "the commandment" and "the law" here—not as applicable to the flesh, but to the moral law; but a deeper insight requires us to understand the Apostle as still at this point consistently throughout speaking of the law of the flesh.

Digitized by Google

Having spoken of the law of the flesh as "the law of sin," he adverts to this, that *the law of the flesh was itself a law instituted by God*, and that the impulses which properly belong to the flesh, as *ordained for the preservation of life*, and without which life could not be propagated, were, in their appropriate and legitimate function, "holy and just and good". Had there been no law of the flesh, there could have been no life—no life temporal, and therefore no life eternal; because it is through temporal life alone that a basis can be laid for life eternal. In the fact, then, that *the laws of the flesh went to support life, they were not sin;* for when God had finished all His works, which He had created and made (and in these were the law of the flesh whereby appetite existed, and the law of self-propagation also, in virtue of which the race was to be continued), God pronounced all to be "very good". *In itself*, then, the law of the flesh was not evil, nor *in itself* was the craving, it might be of hunger or of any other appetite, an evil; but *what made it an evil was, when it was not thoroughly under the restraints of moral law*, which moral law was posited in the organisation of man, as his *governing law;* and was always and invariably a law for the good, *i.e.*, the true wellbeing of the creature; and *it became sin only when its strength or intensification was such as to overrule all proper restraints imposed by the moral law, and by God.*

Hence we understand the question which next proceeds from the Apostle: "Was then that which is good made death to me?" Was this God's intention? *By no means:* he says, "God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good, that sin by the commandment might become exceeding

Digitized by Google

sinful." As if Paul had said: If it be true, then, that God ordained the law of the flesh for the good of man, even for his proper and discreet enjoyment and the preservation of his life; and if God implanted in man the commandment which requires that its *proper* claims should be answered and attended to, is it true that God has made that which was instituted for his good, even for his life and wellbeing, to become sin and death to him? Not at all, saith the Apostle. It is sin that "worketh death by that which is good". How so? In this way—that a craving, *in itself perfectly lawful and proper*, is permitted to have its indulgence when it is utterly unlawful, and improper; in this way, that things, in themselves lawful, should be manifested in circumstances and in instances when moral law proclaims the same to be unlawful, *i.e.*, against all the arrangements and requirements of God.

The true constitution of man, as ordained by God, was that the carnal law, good in itself, shall be in submission to the moral law, and to the express requirements of God; in which case, the general law appointed for man was properly spiritual, in as far as the law of the flesh was ordained to be subject, and the spiritual law was ordained as the governing power. But under the fallen condition that was no longer the case. Man has become "carnal when sold under sin," *i.e.*, when given up as a slave to be the mere subject of the flesh.

I have thought it proper to occupy so much space in the analysis of this very important and much misunderstood argument, employed over this much-contested chapter, for the twofold reason,—first, that it refutes completely the reasoning which has been employed to make the χειρόγραφυν "a bill on the part of God"; and,

Digitized by Google

second, that it goes quite to illustrate and confirm what it is that constitutes the ground of human sinfulness; while also it establishes (and this is no small matter) the natural interpretation of a difficult chapter, and the thorough consistency and concinnity of the question of law as weighing powerfully in the Apostle's mind.

Olshausen also refers to 2 Cor. iii. 6. This verse says: God "hath made us able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life". On referring to his commentary on these words, he calls attention to what he had said on the chapter I have just been considering, Rom. vii. 6. There we have these words: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter". The law here referred to is the law spoken of in the verse immediately preceding, as engendering "the motion of sin working in our members"; and which law was manifested as slain by Christ, the head and representative of a renewed humanity, a statement clearly set forth in the 4th verse as follows: "Therefore, my brethren, ye are become dead to the law, by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God". The great requirement of the gospel is that we should get *married* to Christ. When two are married they become one flesh. To be married to Christ is to become as *one flesh with Christ.* What, then, about "the body of Christ"? *It* has been made dead to the law of sinful flesh. This, says the Apostle, is *just what we should become, together with Him.* His death should become our death. And this Olshausen

Digitized by Google

frankly admits. On said verse (Rom. vii. 4) he writes as follows: "The apostle now applies this comparison (that of marriage, whereby the woman is subject to the law of her husband), by representing the faithful themselves as dead in their old man, and thereby freed from the yoke of the law (Ac. xv. 20), so that the freedom is acquired for them to devote themselves to another husband, even Christ (2 Cor. xi. 2). But the death of the faithful in the old man is again (as in Rom. vi. 2, 4, 6) connected with the death of the Redeemer, so that His death was their death, and did not merely prefigure it; for no one by his own power or resolution can die in the old man, because no one can generate the new man, by whose birth the death of the old man is conditioned. *Christ is therefore the living type both of the old and of the new man,*—of the old, according to the ἀσθενεία τῆς σάρκος (2 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 18) which was in Him, and because He bore the sin of the world; of the new, according to the power of the Eternal Spirit which filled Him. According to this representation it is clear that liberation must not be an act of *self-will.* As little as the wife may wantonly separate from her husband, since his death is requisite for her liberation, so little may the *I* free itself from the law as long as the old man is living."

It does seem remarkable that, with views so penetrating and profound, so sound and scriptural, Olshausen should have mistaken the precise significancy of χειρόγραφον, and regarded it as "the bill of God," and not as the handwriting in its commands, *i.e.*, the law of the first husband, which had to be blotted out, and which could be blotted out only by the death of that husband; and it is all the more noticeable when we find

Digitized by Google

him writing, as follows, at the beginning of his commentary on this chapter (Rom. vii.): "The wife is the property of the husband, and is not free of him *until he dies*"; only, he adds, "the way of applying this parable to the relation of man to sin has its difficulties". There is no real difficulty. The difficulty simply exists when there is a misunderstanding as to the character of the first husband. *It is on this very point that the whole argument turns.* Who or what is the dying husband—the husband that is *doomed* to die—the husband that *must* be put away, or rather that must be sacrificed and slain? I cannot enter upon a sea or great arena of opinions to discuss them, but I hold that the law of carnal ordinances, as lodged *in the flesh*, proceeds *from the flesh* as the first husband. This opinion, *viz.*, that it was *the lust of sin*, was proposed by Augustine and defended by Beza; the second husband being the *power of righteousness* in Christ, Referring to this, Olshausen says: "As in Christ Himself, without prejudice to the unity of *His* personality, the mortal is distinguished from the immortal Christ; so in man also, the old man is distinguished from the new, without prejudice to the unity of *his* personality. In the death of the mortal Christ, *this old man is dead with Him*, and the immortal Saviour of the world arose; so in us, *with the death of the old man the new man becomes living.* The *I* enters upon a new marriage from which the fruits of the spirit are born." (Olsh., Rom. vii. 1-3.)

Olshausen comes wonderfully near sometimes to an explanation of the source of sin, and the conditions which go to its destruction. "The flesh (he says) is understood as the visible veil of the Spirit, and so far σὰρξ appears in equal signification with γράμμα. Next

Digitized by Google

σὰρξ signifies the perishable part of man, in contrast to the eternal imperishable Spirit. The notion of sinfulness is then given with that of decay, for the former is the cause of the latter. Accordingly sinfulness is directly called σὰρξ and ἐπιθύμιαι σάρκος (Eph. ii. 3; John ii. 16; Peter ii. 18). Yet this usage is not (he thinks) to be understood as though the writers of the Bible considered sin to be grounded merely in the bodily impulses, as preponderating sensuality. The σὰρξ is rather to be understood as embracing the whole psychical life with all its will and mind: for without the animating ψυχή, the same being distinguished from πνεῦμα, the σὰρξ alone cannot commit sin. It is certainly correct, however, that σὰρξ can only be used to denote *human sin;* the sin of the world of evil spirits having quite a different character. This latter is of a spiritual nature, and therefore incurable: in the natural man sin has only penetrated the nature of soul and body. The Spirit by being appeased or troubled by sin may be defiled, but it has no sin in its nature. When in man sin occupies the Spirit itself, and proceeds from it, he is then on his way to the sin against the Holy Ghost (Rom. vii. 14). It is true that sin can only be in the *soul*, and moreover in a soul knowing the law of righteousness; but it is no less true that the root of human sin is in the flesh." Olshausen himself refers to νοῦς σαρκός (Col. ii. 18), and σῶμα σαρκός (Col. ii. 11), which latter passage in the *textus receptus* is σῶμα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς σαρκός. Such passages clearly indicate wherein the root of sin lies. They have not (it is true) all the strength of φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός (Rom. viii. 6); for this latter indicates not merely the *mind* and *intelligence* of carnal things, but also the *feeling*

Digitized by Google

and will of the flesh. I agree with the 9th Article of the Church of England on "original or birth-sin," that "the infection of nature whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God"; "for concupiscence and lust hath the nature of sin".

This brings us more immediately to ascertain how it was with the Lord Jesus, who took upon Him our flesh and blood, and whose soul was touched with the affections of our flesh and blood. It cannot be said of Christ that He had the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, because though these were transmitted to His human soul as the cravings and emotions which naturally arose in the flesh, yet they lay in His soul as a *dead letter* having no life, no utterance, no power, no expression. Yet even that *dead letter* or *writing*, which found in Christ no proper *nidus* for its development or manifestation, because of the supremacy of a contrary power, had no rightful place in Him in so far as its tendency, when this was permitted, was contrary to the Spirit. And this explains to us the work of Christ, in "*blotting out the handwriting*, that was contrary to us," in its dogmata or demands.

There is required considerable discrimination to see what is essential, and what is pernicious, in the γράμμα. The γράμμα and the πνεῦμα are in living contrast and antithesis (2 Cor. iii. 6), even as the σὰρξ and the πνεῦμα (Gal. v. 17): at the same time the γράμμα corresponds to the σῶμα which gives *form* to the soul, as a conscious entity, in that it, so to speak, fundamentally fills the soul as a *me*, and gives to it fresh individuality. The Spirit lays hold of that form and

Digitized by Google

purifies it. The latter constitutes the ground of a personal consciousness, because it is this *form* which becomes intellectually personified, as having the environment of the intellectual medium; but then, if there be no counteracting agency properly and peculiarly termed *πνεῦμα*, imparting the stamina of divine truth and rectitude, and consequently the operation of divine power; the "letter," as being the power of the flesh, will only end in death; whereas the "Spirit" giveth that life which cannot die. The "letter" is often confounded with the Old Testament, and the "Spirit" with the New Testament, because the Old Testament is spoken of as the *διακονία τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς κατακρισέως* the ministry whose object is to condemn and to destroy sin; and it is easy to see how this misconception has arisen. The Apostle had just written that God had "made us (the Apostles) able ministers of the New Testament,—not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life". And he goes on thus, "But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory" (2 Cor. iii. 6-9). Rightly understood, it is a grievous mistake to term the Old Testament as equivalent to *γράμμα*. *Γράμμα* is equivalent to *σὰρξ*; and *the law of the Old Testament was a ministration of condemnation and of death against this carnal condition.*

Yet notwithstanding its severity, it was weak to destroy the law of the flesh, because of the strength and living power of the flesh, which it was so difficult to put to death (Rom. viii. 3). And yet after all,

Digitized by Google

the flesh of itself died a natural death, when left to itself; hence the sentence pronounced on the so-called carnal economy, and especially on man, whose carnal condition, as not being his created condition, constituted a state of sin. "But what the law could not do, in that it was weak" to overcome the flesh (and this because it employed a set of carnal ordinances), Christ, who was "the end of the law," and the Party who gave to the law its full power as condemning sin, and as demanding the righteousness of God, and who therefore honoured and established it as the law of God, effected, because of the full compass of the Πνεῦμα which He possessed. Thus the work of Christ lay in destroying the power of the flesh, while the flesh was yet alone; *i.e.*, in destroying the flesh before the natural time, though itself was destined to die; and consequently in communicating new life to the soul and to the members before natural death overtook them as the members of the body. Thus was the redemption, brought in by Christ, very properly termed "a new and living way". Christ brought in a righteousness, which the law had no means of doing, for the new life of man; and this He did through the *blotting out of the handwriting* which constituted the condition of the old man; and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" from the power and dominion of sin, and consequently from the condemnation of sin, even because, in that case, sin had already had its condemnation by the crushing of it in the flesh —by the tearing of the veil of the flesh, *i.e.*, by the removal of that obstruction, which comes between the soul and God.

The sum and substance of all is—that the impress of the flesh as χειρόγραφόν, was abolished by Christ with

Digitized by Google

its δόγματα or demands; and finally nailed by Him to the cross, as being thus annihilated once for all, never again to appear. It was the *law of the sinful flesh which Christ destroyed*, and *not the law which condemns the sin*, which can never be destroyed. Hence we understand Rom. vii. 6. "But now we are delivered from the law [of the flesh], *that* being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter." The *we* has special regard to the soul, *as married of necessity to the one or the other of two husbands* as giving *law* thereto. If the soul is joined to the flesh, then will it be under the law of the flesh; but if the flesh be made dead, then the soul is released from the law of the flesh, and becomes married to another, *viz.*, the Spirit, and is therefore under the law of the Spirit. He who executes this great change in the relation of the soul, as a transference from the dominion of the flesh to the captivity of the Spirit, is Jesus Christ. It happened to Himself in the καταργήσας τὸν θάνατον, in the abolishing of death, which in other words is the ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὴν σάρκα, the stripping Himself of the carnal element, the dogmata of which are called ἄρχαι and ἐξουσίαι; and this happens in us, when we come under "the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus".

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XIII.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM:
OR THE FORMATION AND OPERATION OF SOULS.

THERE is much to be learned respecting the doctrine of *Substance*, and some deny that we can ever learn anything respecting it. Sir William Hamilton said:—"Our whole knowledge of mind and of matter is relative, conditioned, relatively conditioned: of things absolutely, or in themselves, be they external, be they internal, we know nothing; or know them only as incognisable, and we become aware of their incomprehensible existence, only as this is indirectly and accidentally revealed to us through certain qualities—revealed to our faculties of knowledge, and which qualities again, we cannot think as unconditioned, irrelative, existent in and of themselves. All that we know is therefore phenomenal: phenomenal of the unknown." If Hamilton's assertions are well grounded, the sooner we shut up the better; but I do not accept this philosophy: I do not believe in his dogma of human impotence to know realities. I believe that phenomena are the index of realities; I have the best reason for concluding that the restrictions which constitute the relative and conditioned being removed, we are fairly led to a contemplation of the Absolute.

Digitized by Google

What evidence have we for *any* conclusions we can draw? We have simply the evidence of consciousness. Consciousness is *the constant* of intelligence: there can be no intelligence without consciousness: consciousness is the unfailing attribute of intelligence. Our consciousness, then, is fundamentally the evidence on which we are obliged to rest all our findings.

But there are various kinds of consciousness, and in each case, attended with various kinds of conviction. There is the consciousness of Perception, that is the conviction of the presence of external objects—a conviction which we acquire through the external senses; and this is the consciousness which carries with it the highest evidence which we have for any convictions of our Intelligence, unless perhaps the consciousness of self.

It is to be observed, however, that we have the consciousness of self as an individual, secondary to the consciousness which cometh through the senses; not but that self must first be formed before there can be the consciousness of perception; but *self the subject* cannot behold *self the object*, till an impression which is *not-self*, is brought to self. Then it is that a contrast is discerned: then it is we can say *me*, as distinguished from the *not-me:* then it is that the *I* is apparent as different from the *idea* which is the object of its intelligence. Here it should be noted that, until a self is formed, with capacity to display what is properly termed consciousness, the term *sensation* more adequately expresses the experience of the creature. A newly-born child has sensation, but cannot be said to have consciousness. The distinction lies in this, that sensation is purely the bodily impression developed on the new ground of intellectualism, which new ground constitutes

Digitized by Google

what is properly regarded as the territory of soul. There is no substance in the body as such, having the attribute of intellectualism; but when the organisation of the nerve-system of animal nature admits of its display, then it appears; and appears defined precisely by the instrumentality with which the creature is furnished. The impress which first manifests itself is that arising from the vital economy of the body. But this of itself can at first be regarded as sensation only. In the formation of self there can be sensation only: it is only when a self is intellectually formed, that it can have consciousness. The distinction betwixt sensation and consciousness is this: that the former always marks the impress created on the bodily economy, and coming through it, the latter marks the reception of that impress by the *me* as now constituted an intellectual personality. Impressions become first and fundamentally ideas: the *me* is an accumulation of ideas; and when the *me* is framed, fresh ideas are at first objective to the *me*, till they are appropriated by the *me*. The appropriation of them by the *me*, marks *cognition*. The *me* is in this way expanded and enlarged by knowledge.

I return now to the varieties of consciousness. I have said that the highest evidence we have of any truth, is that commonly spoken of as the consciousness of Perception,—the consciousness of direct impressions through the medium of external sense,—the consciousness which is confirmed to us by an appeal to the other senses and to the experience of others, placed in the same circumstances with ourselves—the consciousness which the Scriptures call "infallible proof" (Acts i. 3). The consciousness of Perception is, for example, stronger than the consciousness of Memory. The reason is, be-

Digitized by Google

cause the consciousness of memory is the consciousness of the object at second-hand. The impression received by the *me* in the exercise of memory, is taken off from a copy lodged in the cerebral storehouse, which may be spoken of as the Receptacle of impressions; and must needs therefore be fainter than that which is received directly from the original object outside of us. And this consciousness of memory is in consequence found to vary in persons who have not the same lively impressions of all the particulars or relationships of the object.

Again, there is the consciousness of Imagination. Imagination is the grouping together of the facts of experience, forming a picture of pleasant contemplation or the reverse, according to the nature of the things associated, and the relationship they may happen to have to the *me*. This kind of consciousness is as a rule weaker than that of mere memory, as indicative of external reality, though it may disturb the *me* still more, if the picture brought up have these two elements, first, a belief in it as a reality; and second, a relationship peculiarly affecting the *me*.

Again, there is the consciousness of Conception, *i.e.*, the consciousness of an object which we know has no outer counterpart, but which has been devised as a composite idea, from the pabulum of impressions stored up within; and is therefore an idea peculiarly one's own,—an idea which we strive to realise outwardly when we adjust outward material in conformity with the thought, if we think it may conduce to some good end.

Still further, there is the consciousness which arises, as a conclusion in Reasoning. And this consciousness varies as an evidence of truth, according to the clear-

Digitized by Google

ness of our apprehension and comprehension of all the parts of the object or objects, from which the conclusion is derived. If the object of thought be an abstract element, such as numbers or lines, we can proclaim with certainty the conclusion demanded according to the relation of the things involved, whether in the sphere of numbers, or in that of lines. And the reason of the certainty of our conclusions here, lies in the extreme simplicity of the objects whose relationship it is sought to be ascertained. If the objects whose relation to one another are complex or happen to be not thoroughly apprehended, the reasonings respecting them will be corresponding uncertain. But as a rule those conclusions, which we are accustomed to form under processes of induction, lead to a consciousness which is characterised in many cases by assurance. For example, if we have seen a handwriting, with marked peculiarities, we have small difficulty in detecting the same hand at an after period among many others; and so trace it to its author. In processes of deduction we can prophecy from the facts of experience, and with tolerable certainty, that when certain ingredients, as factors in a causal nexus, are brought together, a particular effect is almost sure to follow.

The only doubt as to our assurance of the result lies in the circumstance, that we may be mistaken as to the precise condition of some of the ingredients; when of course it will follow that if the conditions of the ingredients as they come together are different from those in our apprehension, the result must be modified accordingly. But all this only the more abundantly confirms the law of Causality, that *according to the conditions of the elements brought into combination*, and

Digitized by Google

according to the relationship in which they are made to stand to one another, so precisely will the phenomenon always display itself. And this certainly sets forth the law of causality as always and everywhere inexorably consistent with itself.

Having ascertained, then, what evidence means, and under what circumstances we are to conclude for truth: having ascertained that the strongest groundwork of our consciousness is that which is realised in the exercise of Perception, that is, when obtaining the impressions which come to us through the external senses, and having the best possible grounds for believing that the direct intimations which we receive by the intuitions of Perception are reports of reality,—reports which, when scrutinised, are confirmed by an appeal to all the senses, and by an appeal to our fellow-creatures who receive the self-same intimations, when called on to examine any particular objects, we are right in concluding for the *realism* of the external sphere in which we are placed.[1]

[1] The Duke of Argyll (whose "Unity of Nature" I have just received) says: "All we know of matter is so different from all that we are conscious of in mind that the relations between the two are really incomprehensible and inconceivable to us. Hence this relation constitutes a region of darkness in which it is easy to lose ourselves in an abyss of utter scepticism. What proof have we (it has often been asked) that the mental impressions which we derive from objects are in any way like the truth? We know only the phenomena, not the reality of things. We are conversant with things as they appear, not with things as they are 'in themselves'. What proof have we that these phenomena give us any real knowledge of the truth? How, indeed, is it possible that knowledge so 'relative,' and so 'conditioned' relative to a mind so limited and conditioned by the senses which tell us of nothing but sensations—how can such knowledge be accepted as substantial." And he goes on to say that "it

Digitized by Google

This preliminary being settled, our next step is to see what account we can give of the realities of which we are made conscious. Philosophers are engaged in analysing the phenomena of the world; not only the mechanical relationships of things, but the physiological and chemical relationships of things; and in this way they are prosecuting in its several departments the great problem of Causality. They see forces constantly prevailing in the world; they see forces constantly varying in the world; they see operations persistently going on, as the natural law of a material state of things; and the problem which they desire to solve, and which they hope to solve, is, to *trace these operations to their cause*, and to say what constitutes the *foundation* of force, and what constitutes the source or *initiation* of force.

Man has been hitherto a mystery to himself in this respect. Having the assurance of his own personality —perceiving the body that he bears about with him outwardly as his own; and being sensible of an internal selfhood, with the consciousness of the bodily

is upon suggestions such as these that the Agnostic philosophy or the philosophy of Nescience is founded". There is but one reply to this argumentation, and that is by a *reductio ad absurdum*. I would simply ask—Is there such a thing as any well-grounded affirmation possible? The actual intercourse of the world is a sufficient answer to this. Do not friends and foes alike trust to, and operate upon, the evidence of their senses? Are they ever deceived in so doing, when permission has been granted for examination? Are we not bound therefore to regard the external object as being in reality what the impress of it declares? Upon what ground can we conclude otherwise? Question this, and all philosophy becomes a mass of confusion. Admit it, and we acquire a uniform scheme of consistency: in short, we lay the foundations of law; or rather we acquire a knowledge of *law*, as an operative consistency throughout.

Digitized by Google

states, as peculiarly his own,—seeing the organs of the body in constant operation, whether he sleep, or whether he be awake,—and having the assurance of a will of his own, which is being incessantly exercised during his waking thoughts, the question one comes to ask is this: Whence arise the *operations* which are so variously exhibited to his experience? the operations in the department of *matter*, and the operations in the department of *mind?*—in the former case, the beating of the heart, the flowing of the blood, the playing of the lungs, the services of the liver, the kidneys, and the hundred and one vessels and organs with which the body is furnished; and in the latter case, the sensations of self, the ideas of Perception and of Imagination, of Memory and of Judgment, of Abstraction and of Generalisation, of Discovery and Invention, of Reason and of Reasoning, of Motive and of Will, of Morals such as justice and right, propriety and duty, and the feeling of obligation.

It is a matter of enormous moment to ascertain on what the principle of causality fundamentally rests, whether we have respect to the operations of matter or of mind, and under what circumstances it is begotten.[1]

[1] When we speak of the operations of matter or of mind, we of necessity envisage the existence of *Force*. It is remarkable to notice the varieties of view among learned men attached to this word force. The Duke of Argyll says, "I use the word 'Force' as the cause or source of 'Energy,'" and Professor Tait maintains that *Force* has no real or objective existence. Such pleas forestall the impossibility of all explanation. Instead of Force being the source of Energy, the contrary is the case: Energy is the source of Force. Force is a phenomenon: Energy is not a phenomenon. Force is the result of a causal operation: Energy lies at the foundation of causal operation: there could be no causal operation apart from energy: energy is

Digitized by Google

We find that *two attributes* are essential for this end, one *qualitative* and the other *dynamical.* In prosecuting our inquiries into what may be called the philosophy of Substance *these two attributes must needs lie as the inherent characteristics of Substance;* and inalienable from the very nature of Substance, *viz., Quality and Energy.* These two are inseparable from the very idea of Substance.

Farther, in Substance, as traced to its absolute foundation, we find also that there are *two great categories,* one objective, forming the basis of *matter,* and the other subjective, forming the basis of *mind;* and

antecedent to all manifestation of force. Energy is the inherent attribute of substance as such, and is inalienable from primitive substance. Energy is the basis of elasticity. In primitive substance wherein all quality is *equally balanced,* the energy can have no manifestation as force. Let qualities be differentiated, and the energy in that case must be manifested as force, *by reason of the disturbance.* Force, then, is the phenomenon which arises by reason of the affinity which one quality of substance bears to another quality of substance; and it is the energy that is inherent in substance as such, that is inseparable from substance, which comes to be manifested as force: in which case it comes to be seen that every characteristic of force is developed precisely according to the conditions of things brought into combination. Sprague, in his treatise on Electricity (second edition, p. 9: E. & F. Spon), says "the doctrine of 'the conservation of energy,' which has played so important a part in modern science, teaches that energy is as indestructible, and as impossible to be created as matter" [substance?]. In this statement he is right. Energy is the inalienable attribute of substance as such. But when he says that "energy is the result and measure of the action of force," he confounds its meaning. How can energy be a result if it cannot be created? Force is the transformation of energy into actual momentum: the momentum as noticed being initiated by the affinity of qualities, when brought into that contiguity whereby they can affect each other.

Digitized by Google

that in the sphere of creation, the latter comes to be manifested only through the former.

Farther still, in primitive Substance we find what must properly be regarded as the characteristic of *spirit.* By spirit I mean an all-pervading medium, which cannot by any possibility be banished or separated from itself, or displaced in any way; but, while giving forth qualities as eliminated therefrom, is always and throughout all infinity, intrinsically one unbroken and undifferentiated medium. As an undifferentiated medium, it is what I term the *negative side* of primitive Substance: only this is the side through which *positive* elements as distinctive qualities do operate as natural law, when once these are introduced. Whence come these composite and distinctive qualities?

There must of necessity be *a positive side* of Substance, as well as a *negative.* The difference betwixt the positive and the negative side I take to be this, that the latter is essentially without parts—is one homogeneous whole, having all qualitative characteristics (so to speak) in solution—such, that the negative side of primitive substance must properly be regarded as "the unconditioned": the positive side as "the all-conditioned," must have all the particulars manifested, which prompt the forthbringing of derived particulars; which primitive particulars, existing in one grand combination or union, do in this combination constitute that personality which we call God.

What I say, then, of primitive beinghood is this: that there is a *negative* side, and that there is a *positive* side: that the negative side is the absolute comprehension of all essences, that is of all qualities, in solution; and that the positive side is the absolute comprehension

Digitized by Google

of these in their separate foundations, as distinctive particulars: that the *source* therefore of all secondary substance is in the positive, and that the *foundation* of all secondary substance is in the negative side; that the positive side betokens *absolute personality*, and the negative side *absolute impersonality* and that the former is contained in, and the positive exponent of, the latter, even as all created things, which are positive conditions, have their being in, and their support from, the latter.

Founding thus, I gather several important principles: *First*, there is, and can be no such phenomenon as *immanent* development primarily; that is, there can be no such thing as a spontaneous production primarily, of what we call the works of creation; for the negative, as absolutely devoid of particulars, cannot develop what it does not in any way possess. *Second*, creation can be conceived as simply the *transition* of some particular quality in the positive, as a source, and impressed on the receptive platform of the negative, as a foundation, yielding from itself the energy needful for maintaining the impress thus made as a specialty or specific individuality. *Third*, God as positive beinghood, in the personality of His own particulars, must in this way be regarded as standing apart from His works, and as the independent, self-sustained, and intelligent Source of all organisation. *Fourth*, according to the qualities introduced, and the conditions assigned to these, and according to the relation in which they are made to stand to each other, under the combination of separate elements in a causal nexus, we obtain what is called natural law —law which must of necessity produce its own specific phenomenon and no other, as its spontaneous operation. *Fifth*, such is the exhaustless energy, and persistency

Digitized by Google

of pure spirit (Ether), that, while penetrating and pervading all positive or secondary substance, introduced upon it as a platform, it sympathises with said substance, and so far takes on its characteristics while yet itself remains unbroken in its own original purity. *Sixth*, though thus unbroken, as if it were one continuous solid without an interstice, and though yielding of its essence to form the material of atoms, as themselves the direct basis of what we properly call *matter* as distinguished from what we call *spirit;* and though therewith supplying the energy with which all matter is accompanied; yet there is this to be noted as a special peculiarity, that all matter, commonly so called, is attended with a spirit-representation of its own conditions; that is, *there is a specially conditioned Ether attached to every material object*, through which the forces of natural law are conducted; and this Ether is somewhat denser than the pure and primitive Ether. *Seventh*, such is the exhaustless capacity of Ether, as a medium for the manifestation of force, that in one and the same *locale*, there may be at the same moment any number of distinct and separate forces in independent operation, without collision, without jostling, without interruption, without interference in any way, the one with the other. There seems to be no disputing of these remarkable facts. Attestations have come forth which lead to these conclusions.

Let me note the operation of forces first of all in the Objective sphere. We perceive as a simple fact a great variety of forces simultaneously in operation in the self-same place. In a medium of mere matter this could not be, if matter is regarded as an assemblage of particles under limitation, because the presence of

Digitized by Google

the one must needs thrust out the presence of the other. Two or more distinct and separate material things cannot at the same moment occupy the self-same space. It seems to be otherwise as regards spirit; and this is one of the prerogatives of spirit, which is most difficult of apprehension. I have supposed spirit-substance in the first place to be *absolute continuity;* and in the second place to be *absolute fertility;* and in the third place to be *absolute energy;* that is as having an *exhaustless elasticity,* such, that when drawn out in one way it can at the same instant be drawn out in another way, and in another and still in another; and in each case in sympathy with the special material substance whose conditions have to be maintained; and all this without absorbing, weakening, or indeed in any degree detracting from the absolute subsistence of the primitive Ether. Ether is doubtless the foundation out of which the primary elements of matter have been formed, and physicists will insist that Ether is matter; but the properties now referred to compel us to regard it as the parent of matter—properties to which gross matter cannot lay claim. Matter is limited in respect of its properties, and therefore it can be defined in respect of its properties, as marking the definite peculiarities of its being. It is not so easy to define spirit-substance, on account of the many-hued characteristics which it assumes, according as it operates in connection with the separate qualities *a*, *b*, or *c*: *x*, *y*, or *z*: and all this, without confounding one force with another; but on the contrary, preserving each separate and distinct. I can define spirit, therefore, only by its generic attributes, as the assemblage of all qualities in homogeneous uniformity and in having endless potentiality

Digitized by Google

to support or give validity to whatever qualities are brought into manifestation by their Source or Creator.

In illustration of the variegated powers which belong to Ether, I may refer to its action in the conveyance of light; and further, in the conveyance of the conditions of material bodies which are shewn in light. I would only make a preliminary remark, that it is not unfrequently termed, and mistakingly termed, "the Luminiferous Ether," as if luminosity were a characteristic attribute of the Ether, when it undergoes certain undulatory vibrations, and that it has been termed "calorific or invisible Ether" when it is the bearer of heat without light. It ought to be understood that neither heat nor light are specialties of the Ether; and that it is not undulation or agitation that produces either the one phenomenon or the other in Ether. We are to bear in mind that Ether is *nil per se: i.e., nil*, in respect to the manifestation of any special quality or of any special force *per se*. It behoves first of all, that specific and definite qualities, such as those we find in matter, be introduced; then (whatever those conditions may be) Ether takes hold of these and manifests these, according to a specific law. The Sun, for example, is a great body of matter, either in an incandescent state, or producing the condition of incandescense, in connection with its atmosphere; and the infinite ocean of Ether, in which the Sun moves, lays hold of this incandescence, and carries it forth with an intensity no doubt diminishing as the square of the distance increases! yet otherwise losing its influence according as it falls obliquely or not on the surface of another world-sphere. It will be found that one of the deepest fundamental errors of present-day-science is that of

Digitized by Google

ascribing luminosity as a speciality inherent in Ether. Luminosity is a condition of matter properly so called, and the Ether gives it play as a condition of matter; and so of every other condition of matter, Ether carries it forth.

Hence, it is not merely the conditions of light and heat as such, which Ether conveys, when once a luminous and heated material body is instituted, but thousands upon thousands of other qualities which are perceived by us through the prevalence of light and heat. Hence it has likewise, as the bearer of qualities set up for its conveyance, the prerogative of establishing or setting free the action of Chemical Affinity in Substances. We look forth into the garden variegated with all the hues of summer, and we know that each object with its respective qualities is a centre for the transmission from it of the characteristics of these qualities all round. We look in like manner into a shop window filled with varieties all round; these, in like manner, are all transmitted without confusion into the adjacent space, none overlapping the other, and all, without the slightest clashing of one with another, occupying the self-same place. Here is the wonder of wonders, and something which cannot be questioned—that as Ether carries the luminosity of a lighted body into every portion of the surrounding space, so every separate object, in the medium of the light, is carried in like manner into every portion of the surrounding space; for if a kite should be set a flying in the air, ten thousand eyes from different parts of the surrounding space can see it; and if there should be ten thousand objects set up as things to be seen, each one is separately reflected in surrounding space, its form, its

Digitized by Google

colour, &c.; and all by the exhaustless energy of one and the same spirit-medium. Nor is Ether exhausted by these services. If we wish at the same time to separate light by means of a prism into its constituent colours, that also, and additionally, can be effected. Then there is the separation of light and heat and chemical affinity in the Solar spectrum. We cannot assign a limit to the functions of Ether as the bearer of all the phenomena which present themselves in connection with the conditions of matter.

But farther: we have the forces of Electricity and Galvanism, with which we may combine Magnetism. To what are they to be ascribed? We find light and heat conveyed in the bosom of pure Ether; but as regards the electrical and magnetic forces, they operate properly in a material medium. Can we therefore ascribe them to Ether? It would probably be difficult readily to affirm this, were it not that there is discovered to be a modification of Ether found in or attached to every material substance—a modification that so to speak takes on the characteristic qualities of the respective substances, without its being perceived directly to exist. This view has been ascertained from a number of phenomena; and hereby we find an explanation of what must be mystery itself. In the circumstances, we have scarcely the alternative of refusing to Ether the province of maintaining the forces here referred to.

The correlation of the forces, in their commutation one into another, has been satisfactorily established: What does this indicate? Why, surely this, that, *as the source of all momentum is one dynamical constant throughout; so the momentum varies according to the qualities and conditions of the matter whence it is generated.* That

Digitized by Google

Ether pervades solid material bodies, that matter is not necessarily an obstacle to the operation of Ether, is shewn not only by the passage of light through a transparent body, but also by the passage of the magnetic influence through substances whose quality (such as vitreous substance) does not absorb it. The Duke of Argyll tells us in his excellent publication, "The Unity of Nature," that three-quarters of a century ago, Dr. Thomas Young astonished and amused the scientific world by declaring of the luminiferous medium that he was "disposed to believe that it pervades the substance of all material bodies, with little or no resistance, as freely as the air moves through a grove of trees". Again the same author points to the scientific lectures of Sir J. Herschel, who regards Ether not as air, nor indeed as a fluid, but as a solid; and hence he infers that "this earth must be regarded as in rigid contact with the most distant worlds through a medium which envelops and touches all, and which is incessantly communicating from one world to another, the minutest vibrations which it receives".

Here then we get our eyes opened to the wonderful services performed by Ether; and hence we are constrained to infer not only that it is "an elastic medium of extraordinary tenuity," but that it must be regarded as *the generic basis of all the forces in nature*,—the source of all momentum whatever in the physical world. It has been explained on what principle this conclusion rests, *viz.*, the fact that *quality in matter gives rise to affinity*, and that the inherent energy, which essentially belongs to Ether, takes up the particular affinity, and therefore *displays the particular force* which the qualities in combination are calculated to engender. It is in consequence of the contemporaneous versatility of Ether,

Digitized by Google

its coincident mutability in accomplishing an endless amount of services together, that we feel constrained to take it out of the limitation-category of matter; or rather, seeing it must be regarded as the mother-substance out of which all the atoms of matter have been originally formed, to represent it as the non-limitation-substance of which the atoms of matter are but so many specialities of limitation.

Seeing, then, the physical forces may all be interchangeably transmuted, that heat will give light when a quality peculiarly susceptible of light is introduced (as friction on a lucifer match), and light again will give heat (as flame applied to a jet of gas), that these again will give rise to electricity, which is also produced by friction and chemical affinity; and electricity again will give rise to magnetism, and magnetism under mechanical movement will give rise to electricity: that these again give rise to the operation of chemical affinity either in assisting new combinations or in setting free those already existing; seeing, moreover, that Ether is proved to be the agent in one or two cases under which force operates, and that it operates from the qualities of matter as the initiating principles, it is extremely probable (to say the least) that the same unlimited agent in similar circumstances goes to account for them all.[1]

[1] Since writing the above, I find noble corroboration of the statements in the text from Professor Tyndall in his "Fragments of Science". He asks the question: "Are the vast regions which surround the stars, and across which their light is propagated, absolutely empty?" He tells us there is the interstellar medium of Æther; and he goes on, "The notion of this medium must not be considered as a vague or fanciful conception on the part of scientific men. Of its reality most of them are as convinced as they are of the existence of the sun and moon. The luminiferous Æther has different mechanical

Digitized by Google

We come then to have some apprehension as to the fact that there is a substance at the foundation of all being, which deserves the name of *spirit;* and to see what is the connection which subsists between the illimitable substance so denominated, and the terminal sub-

properties. It is almost infinitely more attenuated than any known gas, but its properties are those of a solid rather than of a gas. It resembles jelly rather than air. It is the vehicle of light; and without it the light of the stars could not be seen. This all-pervading substance takes up their molecular tremors, and conveys them with inconceivable rapidity to our organs of vision." "Again," he says, "we on the earth's surface have night and day in the midst of etherial commotion; the medium is never still; it is in a state of incessant tremor. The sources of this vibration are the ponderable masses of the universe." He speaks of "the force of heat, the force of light, the force of magnetism, the force of electricity, all which terms have been employed more or less loosely by writers on physics. This confusion is happily avoided by the introduction of the term 'energy,' which embraces both tension and *vis viva.*" He gives to energy, however, a meaning which I have not been able to assign to it. I have throughout regarded energy as the *capacity of force*, whereas he employs it to denote actual "dynamic agency" or "potential energy," thereby giving to energy a *positive* character, whereas I must humbly think in primitive substance, as such, it has simply a *negative* character, and acquires *positive power* only when some particular quality is present as the motive-power which initiates force, *i.e.*, where quality is disturbed, or is changed in its conditions, by temperature, by affinity, or otherwise. But what confirms my estimate of Ether is, that Tyndall makes it *the universal medium of conveying force from matter, and of carrying force to matter.* "Radiation (he says) is the communication of vibratory motion to the Æther, and when a body is said to be chilled by radiation, as for example the grass of a meadow on a star-light night, the meaning is that the molecules of the grass have lost a portion of their motion by imparting it to the medium in which they vibrate. On the other hand the waves of Æther may so strike against the molecules of a body exposed to their action, as to yield up their motion to the latter; and in this transfer of the motion, from the Æther to the molecules, con-

Digitized by Google

stance which we call *matter*, I say that the former, as primitive substance, has *energy* and *generic quality* as its inherent attributes; and that matter is in its proper foundations a specific quality thereof, originated in the form of atoms, and hence that all the qualities of matter,

sists the absorption of radiant heat." Tyndall, like other scientists, makes the atom the centre of potential energy, thereby constituting it *per se* the *cause* of force, whereas I believe the atom to be itself a *result*, as a created element, a particular, created out of a generic medium, somewhat analogous to the creation of a particular colour out of white light, as itself colourless, and having no particular in that respect. Qualities being hereby introduced, power is herewith introduced; and the power becomes force in virtue of the affinity of one quality for another;—a force which has its realisation through the inherent energy which pertains to the all-pervading medium. The power of this medium he shews very emphatically at what he calls "the focus of invisible rays". "The Æther at the focus, and not the air, is the substance in which the heat is embodied." Again he says: "The Æther which conveys the pulses of light and heat not only fills celestial space, swathing suns and planets and moons, but it also encircles the atoms of which these bodies are composed. It is the motion of these atoms, and not that of any sensible parts of bodies, that the Æther conveys. The atom sending its pulses through the Æther resembles a tuning-fork sending its pulses through the air." There is here a remarkable phenomenon which Professor Tyndall very nearly touches upon, but which he fails to bring out, *viz.*, that not only is the *motion* initiated by the atoms communicated to the Ether, but the *quality* which belongs to, or which is contained in, the material element as a particular, is also imparted to and is conveyed by the Ether. And so we find that not only is sound as such conveyed by the air, but the quality which pertains to the sound is taken up by the Ether, and, after being silently carried along thereby, is reflected again on a material basis adapted to receive it. (See "Fragments of Science," pp. 2, 7, 33, 45, 74, 83, &c.)

The authors of the "Unseen Universe" tell us that Ether has apparently an incongruous character, from one point of view as a fluid, from another as an elastic solid, whose resistance is not appreciable, transmitting light 188,000 miles per second notwith-

Digitized by Google

as coming from one foundation, must shew an affinity of some sort, when the particular qualities are brought into combination.

All this, however, has respect but to one fundamental side of spirit. This fundamental side, which I refer to

standing transverse disturbances. They speak of Ether being distorted as well as displaced by matter passing through it, not seeming to observe that matter is not an obstacle to Ether, and therefore cannot displace it. They admit a certain amount of condensation as applicable to Ether. Yet they hold that is practically incompressible. They conclude by saying that, however it may be regarded, the properties of Ether are of a much higher order in the arena of nature than those of tangible matter; for "it is capable of vastly more than any one has ventured to guess" (Chap. IV.).

Wurtz in his "Atomic Theory," p. 307, says: "In the hypothesis of the continuity of matter, the mass which fills the entire universe is in permanent state of vibratory motion. Waves are transmitted through it in different directions and cross each other. From the intersection of the waves result nodal surfaces and nodal points, and consequently the limited portions of matter. The diversity of matter would result from the diversity of the systems which traverse it, and we can logically conceive that these portions thus limited, these vibrating skies, these concamnations, if we may use the word, represent the particulars of matter, which enter into conflict in chemical reactions." He again says, "Ether is not a vacuum. It is a medium formed of a highly rarefied and elastic matter, agitated by perpetual vibrations which are transmitted from atomic matter to the Ether, and from the Ether to atomic matter. Is it a homogeneous continuous medium? Is it formed of atoms of a second order, a kind of monads which by their aggregation would form ponderable matter itself? Though imperceptible and imponderable this medium has nevertheless a density. It extends between all parts of the Universe. As a transmitter of radiations, it receives and transmits to us under the form of light and heat, the vibrations impressed upon it by the sun and the most distant stars, and sends into space those which proceed from one solar world to another. And the same exchange is established in the infinite domain of the infinitely small. It is this incessant communication of meteors, this perpetual exchange of energy

Digitized by Google

as Ether, presents only the objective basis of primitive substance, which yields what we call *matter*. There is obviously a subjective or crowning basis of primitive substance, through which alone we can account for what is called the phenomena of *mind*.

between the Ether and atomic matter which gives rise to the most important phenomena of physics and chemistry." The same author says —"Helmholtz has discovered the fundamental properties of matter in vortex motion"; and Sir William Thomson has stated—"This perfect medium (Ether) and these vortex rings represent the Universe. A fluid fills all space, and what we call matter are portions of this fluid which are animated with vortex motion. There are innumerable legions of very small fractions or portions of this fluid, but each of these portions is perfectly limited, distinct from the entire mass, and distinct from all others, not only in its own substance, but in its mass and in its mode of motion—qualities which it will preserve for ever. These portions are atoms. In the perfect medium which contains them all, none of them can change or disappear, none of them are found spontaneously. Everywhere atoms of the same kind are constituted after the same fashion, and are endowed with the same properties. It is well-known, in fact, that the atoms of Hydrogen vibrate exactly in the same periods, whether we heat them in a Guisler's tube, observe them in the sun, or in the most distant nodulæ." ("The Atomic Theory," p. 328.)

The Duke of Argyll in his "Unity of Nature," says: "Light reveals to us the fact that we are united with the most distant worlds, and with all intervening space by some etherial atmosphere which embraces and holds them all. The enormous velocity with which the vibrations of this atmosphere are propagated, proves that it is a substance of the closest continuity, and of the highest tension (186,000 miles in a second of time); and although it is impalpable, invisible and imponderable, we know that it is a medium infinitely more compact that the most solid substances that can be felt and weighed" (p. 11). The Duke, however, mistakes when he says that "light is nothing but the undulatory movement of a substantial medium". We would rather say light is the quality of luminosity in matter carried by this universal medium with an intensity decreasing as the square of the distance increases.

Digitized by Google

The simple questions, What are Souls? and Whence come they?—questions of deepest mystery according to ordinary inquiry, open up to us a field of most interesting and instructive consideration. There can be no dispute as to our *mental* individuality—that which constitutes *the conscious ego:* nor can there be any dispute that this ego has the characteristic of consciousness—a characteristic not known, not found in ordinary matter: and yet farther, there can be no dispute that the *I* which thinks, is inextricably associated, and obviously has its foundation, in connection with the outer man of our perception.[1]

[1] We have a happy enough expression, ascribed to Professor Huxley, *viz.*, "the physical basis of life,"—a phrase which indicates that whatever life may be, as having a source in some unseen energy, there can be the manifestation of life only in connection with a physical ground. Much more, I think, may be said of *the physical basis of mind.* As there is no life *per se* apart from the etherial or objective basis in which it is manifested; so, there is no mind *per se* apart from the etherial basis of which it is the development. But there is this distinction (an important one) betwixt life and mind; that *life* is properly to be regarded as wholly an etherial phenomenon, dependent on what may properly be termed a *static organisation*, that is an organisation which has no power of voluntary movement, that is no power of spontaneity as under the heritage of will; while *mind* is to be regarded as an etherial phenomenon, *crowned with a subjective sensation or consciousness;* and this mental state is dependent on what in contrast may be termed a *nerve organisation*, with limbs jointed for free movement in obedience to impulse. It is not to be supposed that in the one case there is any life, or in the other case any mind, apart from some organisation. Yet (how strange) in the latest productions (those of Mr. Drummond and the Duke of Argyll), we hear of life being the antecedent and the cause of organisation—that "the homes and abodes of life are prepared and shaped under the control and guidance of that mysterious power, which we know as vitality". Upon what possible principle can we account for the

Digitized by Google

What then can be said of mind, as compared with matter? We have found *matter* to be a phenomenon under definite limitation: I have endeavoured to trace what are the causal elements of this phenomenon; and I conclude that matter is a compound of primitive elements called atoms, like the letters of the Alphabet, which are properly the foundation of words, as words are of sentences; and that the atoms, like the letters, have each its own specific power, and are themselves originated out of Ether, by a primordial intelligent Agent, in order to supply the materials of physical creation. We find *mind* in like manner to be a phenomenon; and it must therefore, like matter, have not only a foundation, but also a cause. As the foundation of *matter* lies in the primitive substance of Ether, as being the basis of all physicism, that is as the ground of what we call an objective economy for the world; so I feel, we must look for the foundation of *mind* correspondingly in that which is generically the basis of all mind, from the first symptoms of sensation to the ultimate manifestations of a high intellectualism. Analogy compels to this, and it introduces a hypothesis perfectly sufficient to account for every possible characteristic of mind in being.

And hereby we come to have some apprehension of

systematic varieties of life proceeding from this said "mysterious power" of vitality? I confess, little as I sympathise with the teaching of Mr. Spencer, I prefer his definition of life when he terms it "the adjustment of internal relations to external relations". But I call life *the adjustment of etherial relations in accordance with the organisation of a material type primarily introduced by the Creator.* As to mind: *it is this adjustment of life, crowned with the consciousness thereof, developed from the cognitive side of spirit.*

Digitized by Google

the whole arena of primitive substance to which I give the name of *spirit*. There belong essentially thereto two great departments, which never can be confounded, —which never can by any rational process be run up into one—which must stand always fundamentally separate and distinct; and to those we give the names of objective and subjective; the former being the basis of all matter, the latter being the basis of all mind. Now while the foundations of the former may be laid, and its developments manifested, in nature *per se*, the foundations of the latter do not appear *per se*, but are always and invariably manifested through the former. In other words, we have the development of the subjective, through the organisation of the objective: mind as the crowning feature of substance shews itself only in and through the etherial department of substance. The circumstances under which mind shews itself may be briefly stated as those in which it has a field for its operation. Mind has no means of operation in a clod or in a stone: nor has mind any freedom of operation even in a tree, for the reason that it has no means of voluntary motion. It has the motion of its own natural laws, whereby growth is manifested, but it has no power of voluntary or spontaneous self-movement.

It is only in the animal kingdom, then, that we can know mind, because therein alone it is, that we perceive the possibility of sensation, as indicative of bodily feeling. Sensation may be described as bodily feeling, that is, a bodily state developed on mental ground. And while mere objective etherial matter can have no sensation, the very fact of sensation indicates the presence of that subjective element, which forms the basis of mind. Mind comes to be developed and enlarged, according as

Digitized by Google

scope is afforded by the material organisation for variety of impressions. In plain terms, the basis of mind hangs on the basis of matter; and the ideas of mind are fundamentally the impressions received from matter. The crowning point of the subjective is to set forth the conditions of the objective in the form of cognitions. All is determined by the limitations prescribed by the bodily organisation of the creature. What I say, therefore, is this, that so soon as the organisation of living matter lays a foundation, whereon there is scope for mind, that department of spirit out of which mind comes, naturally and necessarily imparts itself; and this precisely as the range of the organisation prescribes.

It may be asked, How can we be sure that our souls are of the nature of spirit, and not of matter? The answer is, *first*, that souls have the attribute of *intellectualism* (an attribute in no way descriptive of matter), in as far as this is the foundation of thought; and *second*, that souls, in receiving fresh accessions of new ideas, can never be so loaded as to be incapable of receiving still more; and this prerogative exists without destroying the identity of the individual,—which facts cannot be predicated of mere matter. There is this remarkable about souls, that they can sustain a multitude of separate and distinctive cognitions at one and the same moment. The eyes, the ears, the nostrils, the palate, the hands, any part of the body, or the whole surface of the body, may all be operated on, at the same time, as portals of impression, and the soul within can be sensible of these all at once. This is not consistent with what we know of matter. Our souls supply criteria in this way, which cannot belong to mere matter. If we add to matter certain material properties, it is no longer

Digitized by Google

what it was: it loses its proper identity: it loses it by chemical infusion: it loses it by mechanical alteration: it loses it when its form is changed, or when other properties are superinduced upon it. I define matter, therefore, as *limitation*, whether we have respect to Quantity or Quality. But while our souls are properly regarded as an indivisible Unity, constituting primarily and fundamentally the physiological presentation of the various conditions of our bodily framework, we have therein an enlarged, and ever enlarging, acquisition of a variegated intelligence, both from the outside world, and from the inductions which we are constantly drawing from the inner field of our experience; and all this, as has been noticed, takes place without disturbing or confounding the identity of the *me*.

Having then acquired these general views with respect to the characteristics of spirit:—of spirit as applicable to the *objective* side of existence, and of spirit as applicable to the *subjective* side of existence, I come now to inquire under what circumstances the foundation of the soul is laid, and the superstructure of the soul is built up. Professor Tyndall, who cannot get beyond the material, as the fundamental essence of beinghood, asks, "At what moment did the soul come in? Did it enter at once or by degrees? Perfect from the first, or growing and perfecting itself contemporaneously with its own handiwork? Is it localized or diffused?" And so forth. He tells us that Professor Frohschammer, in 1855, was hardy enough to question the belief that every human soul was sent into the world from God by a separate and supernatural act of creation, and to affirm that man (body and soul) comes from his parents; and that the book containing these

Digitized by Google

views was branded as "pestilent" and stamped with the condemnation of the Church. "But (continues the Professor) if the Jesuit's notion be rejected, what are we to accept? Physiologists say that every human being comes from an egg, not more than $\frac{1}{120}$th of an inch in diameter. *Is this egg matter?* I hold it to be so (he says) as much as the seed of a fern, or of an oak: nine months go to the making of it into a man." "Consider (he says) the work accomplished during these nine months, in forming the eye alone, with its lens, and its humours, and its miraculous retina behind. Consider the ear with its tympanum, cochlea and Corti's organ, an instrument of three thousand strings built adjacent to the brain, and employed by it to sift, separate and interpret, antecedent to all consciousness, the sonorous tremors of the external world. Matter I define as that mysterious thing by which all this is accomplished. How it came to have this power is a question on which I never ventured an opinion. Theories of evolution go but a short way toward the explanation of this mystery, while in its presence the notion of an atomic manufacturer and artificer of souls, raises the doubt, whether those who entertain it were ever really penetrated by the solemnity of the problem, for which they offer such a solution."

Along with Professor Tyndall, I accept the great facts of natural law as now stated by him; and yet I think we can so far penetrate into the wonderful formations which take place under its operation—formations which an absolute evolution not only does not explain, but which obviously have their validity only through the immanence or development of those properties which have been primarily made and concentrated in the germ.

Digitized by Google

Our concern here is, not to question the laws of nature, as to *matter propagating matter*, in all the ingenious forms which are set forth within the range of the inorganic and the organic; but simply with the laws of nature, in furnishing what we denominate souls, as something over and above matter; and yet conjoined with matter, in our physical economy. And for this, I lay my foundation, by appealing to Professor Tyndall himself. He tells us, for example, that there is a fluid in the magnet, and he himself shews very clearly the fact of its existence—a fluid distinct and separate from the molecules of the magnet, as a mass of matter. No doubt he may call this fluid by the name of matter; for he regards Ether as a sort of refined matter. What signifies the *name* if we can be agreed about the thing? He has himself shewn the wonderful properties belonging to Ether, as in point of fact *the one constant* throughout all nature, in the operations of natural law. Whether we have recourse to the phenomena of light and heat, of gravitation and chemical affinity, of electricity and magnetism, of the operations which take place in growth, in the vegetable or animal economies, in short, throughout the whole field of forces, that display themselves in the operations of natural law, we have recourse to this agent as the *one constant servitor*, in bringing out phenomena from pre-existing objects, and in marking out details according to the combinations of things in the relationship in which they may happen to be brought into contact.

I go along with Professor Tyndall, then, in holding that throughout all space, we know of what he calls a "very elastic medium," which I call *spirit*, for the reasons which have already been adverted to; and I

Digitized by Google

farther call his attention to the fact—a most important fact, which physicists admit, that "the elasticity of this medium is less, when entangled among the particles of a body, than in the freedom of absolute space, which would otherwise be termed vacuum. This consideration is all-important. It is this change, this sympathy of the Ether with the matter of the material object, that explains to us the current of electricity as confined to the wire, compared with the Ether outside of the wire. So far, surely, we may be regarded as at one. I call attention farther to the fact, that this Ether is *the bearer not merely of the disturbance or agitation*, which prevails among the molecules of matter, *but the bearer also of the qualities* which by transition are applied to and belong to the matter,—the qualities which therefore shew themselves in the matter. There is abundant evidence of this. Ether, it has been noticed, is not fitted to develop sound, as a quality properly developed only in matter: for if a bell is rung in an exhausted receiver, no sound is emitted: this peculiar quality requires the matter of the atmosphere, in order to its being duly developed on the nerve of the ear. Yet we find as a fact that Ether can be the bearer of any characteristic of sound, in as far as the precise quality of sound may be *silently* carried along an electric wire for miles, and developed on a surface prepared to display it. That the *qualities* of things, as well as the mere *force* which carries the qualities, are conveyed by the Ether, is testified every moment of our waking existence by the presentation of the colours and shapes of the objects of the world that are around us,—colours and forms which we behold also on the photographic plate which receives an image, and also when we behold our countenances in

Digitized by Google

a mirror. The senses of smell and of taste confirm to us the same great truth; for we can no longer suppose that the Newtonian theory of light, as refined particles, applies to smell or to taste; but the nerves in either case, accurately convey, that is the Ether which sympathises with each peculiarity of nerve, and so to speak puts on that peculiarity, conveys the conditions of each separate quality to the brain.

Here then I obtain something like solid ground, on which to take my stand for the position of a *soul;* for here assuredly is conducted to a receptacle of impressions, the qualities which are conveyed by the series of nerves which belong to the five senses. But prior to *their* operation, a *foundation of soul* is properly laid. In the womb the ordinary senses have had no scope for operation; yet in order to the child being born, a living body has been formed, and the system of sympathetic nerves have been in play, or have so far begun to play, a system which brings the conditions of the bodily economy into the union of one central focus. Hence we have the basis of the soul established, in that here we have the etherial representations of the bodily self mirrored, so that there comes to be a delineation of bodily conditions accompanied with a subjective ground. What then? Why, here it is *under this centralisation of bodily states*, all gathered together in one etherial ground, that *the sublimer characteristic of consciousness shews itself:*—shews itself as the crowning attribute of cognitiveness attached to this representation—shews itself, indeed, as the subjective consciousness of external man. This subjective consciousness is the development of the property of intellectualism, just as the property of intellectualism comes into play when scope, and only

Digitized by Google

so far as scope, or opportunity, or freedom is supplied for its exercise.

The foundation therefore of a *me* is laid by means of the sympathetic system of nerves, as conducting the conditions of the bodily economy to a centre, when having these conditions lodged in the material framework of the brain, they are, *according to all analogy*, etherially delineated in the spirit-representation which accompanies the brain. And to this central receptacle of impressions thus established, are carried all those impressions which come through the eyes, and ears, and taste, and touch, and smell, with which the body is endowed; and these impressions constitute so many accessions to the *me* thus founded and established.

The soul then has its *foundation* in that spirit which is everywhere prevalent throughout the universe, and is hereby separated and unified into an individual in the way here set forth; and as we have seen, it consists of an objective and a subjective sphere in one. The objective sphere consists of the Etherial element, wherein impressions are constituted as *ideas*, and the subjective sphere consists of the Intellectual element, wherein impressions are received as *cognitions*. The objective sphere of soul is that wherein the form and quality of every soul, as an entity begotten of the body, are prescribed; the subjective sphere is that whereby each soul has a cognition of its own states. The objective sphere, as being the etherial side of spirit, lies more immediately connected with matter, and representative of matter; and it no doubt forms the foundation of *the spirit-body*, hereafter to be realised, when at the resurrection a more refined condition of beinghood shall be constituted; and the subjective, as being the intel-

Digitized by Google

lectual side of spirit, will always display the consciousness of the etherial economy. Whatever changes the etherial comes to undergo, the intellectual has of course the consciousness of the same.

Can we, then, in some degree fathom the depths, and sound the process of soul-formation,—a process which Professor Tyndall will not, I trust, deny as competent, under the reign of what is called natural law? I thus abjure all transcendentalism. The transcendentalist knows nothing as to the source of mind. He knows simply the fact that mind exists; but *when* it comes, or *whence* it comes, or *how* it comes, to be manifested, he is in uttermost ignorance. Hence, by the way, certain grievous mistakes as to the operations of mind (not the least of which has been the ascription to the mind of man of a "pure reason," and "a motiveless will," *i.e.*, an *a priori* reason, and an *a priori* will), of which, as phenomena, no account as to their causality can be given. I hold fast by the *a posteriori* process, of reasoning from facts to conclusions; and though the mere physicist has not been able by this process to get beyond what is usually termed materialism, I think I can point to a ground of fact, which should be acknowledged by the physicist, and satisfactory to the spiritualist, for the foundations of the soul; and the ground becomes thus narrowed by the inquiry:—Have we not a physical basis for soul? And is not the soul so developed, a purely spirit-entity? And does it not as a spirit-entity simply represent the experiences of which it is a partaker? What I say therefore is, that in the foundations of soul are found the Etherial *me*, as representing the bodily conditions, and therefore the dispositions that belong thereto, and come therefrom; and that the sub-

Digitized by Google

jective or cognitive condition of this *me*, is set forth as the characteristic *consciousness of those conditions*—a consciousness that can come into play, only in circumstances wherein freedom is given for the operation of Intellect, and the expression of intelligence.

In what way, now, are the operations of soul, *i.e.*, of the human mind conducted? It can only be as *intelligence* in the first place, and as *will* in the second place.

As to intelligence, we know that first of all we have *Perception*. Perception implies that the objects of the world outside the mind, are the source and ground of ideas inside the mind; and that the ideas inside the mind represent to us the reality and character of the objects outside. All men in the practical affairs of life hold this view: nor is it easy to see how it can be otherwise. The difficulty has been to expound the process; and it seems strange that this difficulty should have so long existed. Having so abundant exemplification of the fact, that in the medium of light, the objects of the world have all around, their individual image set forth, so that one image does not jostle against another or thrust out another; the inference follows, that the image of the object is pictured on the eye, and is carried by the optic nerve in connection with the eye, to the territory of cognition within; or more strictly to that central place in the brain, where already there is established the condition of selfhood, as already described. Whether the basis of this selfhood be laid at the Thalami Optici, the Medulla, or at some other sensorial centre, at the basis of the Brain, need not here be matter of inquiry. The fact stands revealed to us, that there is the conduction of images from the outside world, by means of the organ of sight, inwardly to the brain;

Digitized by Google

and we explain the proofs of our subjective experience of them, by saying that these images being first of all revealed on the platform of the brain, even as we see images revealed on a mirror, they are of necessity taken up and appropriated by the etherial environment as ideas, which accompany and represent the conditions of the brain; and as this etherial environment is, in the peculiar circumstances, crowned with the cognising prerogative, as the highest vested attribute of spirit-substance; so in the circumstances there is here, of necessity, *a cognition of the ideas* thus introduced.

This explanation of the operation of Intelligence in one case, must serve to expound the operation of Intelligence in all cases where the exercise of Perception, that is cognition by means of the external senses, is concerned. The exercises of Memory, and of Imagination, and of Conception, and of drawing inferences by Induction and Deduction, are all of them clearly explainable by means of the cerebral instrumentality with which we are by nature endowed. *In every exercise of the mind we are dependent on the cerebral instrumentality;* and each portion is adapted to execute its own particular function. There is obviously in the cellular strata of the brain, a great storehouse wherein impressions are laid up, and these impressions once laid up, may by association with some related impression freshly received, be called up, that is recalled, and be once more set before the cognising self, and be recognised as something already known. Here we have Memory.

And what is Imagination but the grouping together, out of said storehouse, a series of impressions which happen to have come within the category of our ex-

Digitized by Google

perience. There are associating cerebral fibres for this end.

The exercise of Conception, again, seems somewhat more complicated; it has respect to devising or inventing a scheme whereby to accomplish a purpose. Hence before a fresh conception can be formed, there must be set before the mind first of all, a *schema* or delineation demanding to be filled up, that is, something having a want, in order to have a purpose served, and for which there is no apparent means to supply the want. This involves a different process of association,—a process whereby to build up a mould so as to supply a want, or fill up a scheme of thought which shall bridge over a difficulty, or in any way set forth a connective link whereby a difficulty is overcome.

The exercise of Reasoning is no doubt involved in Conception, but reasoning as such is simply the harmonisation or adaptation of objects brought together. In drawing inferences the process is different. The drawing of inferences I would call *the applications of experience to new circumstances.* The drawing of an inference is simply *the linking on of a conclusion of our experience to a cognate principle;* for instance, if I look upon a house I infer that some one has built it: if I look upon a book I infer that some one has written it. This is Induction. Again, if I see fire I infer that it will burn me if I touch it: if I see paper I infer that it will be useful for being written upon. This is Deduction. In Induction we connect a subject with its cause; and in Deduction we connect a subject with its effect or phenomenon, and this indicates the purpose which it can serve: and this, agreeably to the experience which we have enjoyed of a similar subject; and in all these pro-

Digitized by Google

cesses of thought, nothing can be done but through the cerebral instrumentality with which we are gifted.

There are other exercises such as Abstraction, and Generalisation,—in the one case by analysis insulating the forms of things, and laying hold of these insulated forms by themselves; and in the other by synthesis combining those insulated forms into new compounds. There is also the exercise of Judgment, whereby we compare objects with some standard we happen to have already acquired; and thus according to our standard we pronounce on character; but all is the work of that portion of the Brain-apparatus, whereby the various mental states are acquired. So far then I account for Intelligence—intelligence in all its variety.

I now come to speak of *Will.* Every exercise of will depends upon a motive: there is no such thing as will without a motive. But what is a *motive*, and whence does it come? A motive is an emotion in the *me;* and this emotion forms the foundation of will, and indeed it constitutes will, when there is no counteracting motive or emotion to stay its exercise. And whence have we Emotion? Emotion arises from *the contact of an idea just introduced, with the me;* and operates as an emotion, according to the quality of the idea as it happens to affect the *me.* If some question of foreign politics is intimated to me, the idea excites no emotion in my mind, because I am not interested therein. If I am told the same thing as touching home politics, I have a certain amount of interest, and I may be induced thereby to take some action therein, provided the matter concerns me. If the idea affects me personally, whether for good or for evil, an emotion arises at once to help onwards for its coming to pass in the former

Digitized by Google

case; or to prevent its coming to pass in the latter case. Every emotion, in constituting will, must of necessity correspond with *the mode in which any idea, when introduced, affects the me.* If I hear that a beloved relative has died, I am affected with pain, and the pain exists without any motive to exercise will, unless there comes along with this idea, an intuition of circumstances demanding my action. If the intelligence simply is that the relative is ill, I have in that case an emotion to render what aid the case seems to demand.

I have said that the emotion, as it first arises, does itself constitute will, when there is no counteractive emotion or motive. As a rule, in the lower animals there is no counteracting emotion: in their case, as a rule, the rising of an emotion constitutes will, unless some other idea present itself at the same time which arouses a conflicting emotion. For example, if a dish of meat stands before a hungry dog, the sight of it will move him to partake of it; but if at the same time a stick is held over his head threatening him with a blow if he touch the meat, a countercheck is imposed; that is an opposing emotion does in the circumstances hinder the first emotion from being carried into will.

Counterchecks are very common in the case of man. The emotion to will comes first from *the primary idea;* but this brings up *a secondary idea, viz.*, a foresight of the consequence of carrying said primary emotion into volition; and so according to the mode in which the secondary idea operates on the *me*, does the will become modified, *i.e.*, a countercheck is imposed by the secondary idea. It is seldom in the case of man, that a secondary idea is wanting, as following upon the emotion which a primary idea excites. I call that *a*

Digitized by Google

primary idea, which comes directly through the senses from the external world. I may walk through my garden, and seeing a flower somewhat attractive, I may be moved to pluck it and to apply it to my nostrils; but if along with a sight of the flower, I have the knowledge that it belongs to my daughter, and is cherished by her, this apprehension imposes a check upon my plucking the flower, because I do not wish to offend her. If I am in the garden of another, the self-same emotion to pluck the flower may in the same circumstances arise, and the emotion constitutes the tendency of will to possess the flower; but here again I am checked by the intuition that it belongs to another, and in order that this check may be removed, I ask the owner if I may have the flower. Upon permission being granted, the first emotion then becomes will. Thus I point to the foundations of will.

And this leads me to the territory of *Morals.* Will in morals is exercised on the same principle as will in regard to purely physical arrangements, the distinction being that in morals we are concerned with ideas which bear upon *the wellbeing of a creature susceptible of pleasure or of pain.* When a primary idea, or what I have called a direct idea, excites the emotion of desire, you have at the back of this an intuition of the effect that must be produced on yourself or on another, should that desire become will and volition : *it is this intuition of consequences* that constitutes the secondary idea which arouses a counteractive emotion, whereby the primary emotion is either rejected, or controlled and regulated. And the basis of this controlling power is found in that natural tendency which seeks *the wellbeing of the creature. The foundation of all moral law lies in this*

Digitized by Google

maxim,—THE WELLBEING OF THE CREATURE. Man may of course make mistakes as to what in some cases constitutes the best wellbeing of himself or of others, and his moral emotions will be erroneous accordingly; but the fact of misapprehension intellectually does not in the least interfere with the principle that *the wellbeing of the creature is the principle which forms the ground of morals.* Injury to that wellbeing is universally regarded as *evil;* and hence it is the idea of injury that raises at once an emotion of *ought-not* against the evil; furtherance of that wellbeing, on the other hand, is regarded as *good;* and hence this idea raises an emotion of *ought*, as a satisfaction to moral law. What I would say then is this, that a foresight of evil or of good (as affecting the wellbeing of a creature susceptible of pleasure and of pain), through a direct or primary idea, and this foresight as a secondary idea, rouses a moral emotion, which operates as a countercheck to, or modifying influence over, the primary motive or emotion, which, if carried into effect, would affect the wellbeing of the creature; and hereby the law of morals is vindicated.

This conception of the foundation of moral law is of unspeakable importance. Will has not unfrequently been defined as the power to check any emotion or impulse that may arise; and the question that has been regarded as one of the most difficult to answer, is—Whence arises this power of intellect to check, control or regulate any rising emotion, whether as an appetite, or passion, or desire? The difficulty has been thought one of the greatest with which the *a posteriori* philosopher has to contend, in as far as it has been inferred that Intellect has an inherent power of willing *per se*

Digitized by Google

of which no account can be given, the will being looked on as the free self-originating force of the pure Ego. I am prepared to demonstrate that this power of self-restraint which belongs to the human soul, and which is commonly spoken of as *the will* of the Ego, has not its foundation in pure intellect as such, but arises from the indirect idea always brought up, by what may be termed the incipient emotion from the direct idea. All emotions of whatever sort are, without exception, created by ideas, and precisely as the ideas affect the *me;* and when a primary emotion, as aroused by what I have termed a *direct* idea, as an impression through the outward sense, presents itself before the mind as something to be done, this always and invariably begets what we may call an *indirect* idea, *viz.*, an idea of *the consequences* of accomplishing said emotion. A single example will serve to illustrate this statement as a part of our constant experience. George Stevenson tells us that when a working engineer he had been induced more than once by the foreman of the workshop to go with him to the ale-house; but that on going with him on an after-occasion, he stopped short on the very threshold of the public-house, and refused to go in. The question is—*Whence arose this refusal, this will,* which checked the impulse to enter the place? The answer is, *a foresight of the consequences.* It is this foresight of consequences in connection with any contemplated course of action, which constitutes what I have called the *secondary* or *indirect idea* which thus serves to modify the operation of the soul.

The whole philosophy of will, then, is this. *First,* observe! there is no such phenomenon as will without a motive: *Second,* there is no motive but as the result of

Digitized by Google

an idea affecting the *me: Third,* ideas are *direct* or *indirect: Fourth,* direct ideas create primary emotions, and indirect ideas create secondary emotions, which latter go to regulate or counteract the primary emotions in constituting will: *Fifth,* as regards the field of *morals,* when direct or primary ideas create emotions which *bear upon the wellbeing of a sentient creature,* there arises the operation of moral law or conscience.

And what of man's *spiritual nature*? The spiritual nature is perfectly analogous in its operation to that of the moral nature. Spiritual emotions come from spiritual ideas, even as moral emotions come from moral ideas, just as carnal or worldly emotions come from carnal or worldly ideas. Man's spiritual nature comes from the teaching of the Bible, that is, from those ideas that are the teaching of God. The teaching of the Bible is properly spoken of as the communications of the Holy Spirit. Hence Divine ideas having attached to them the peculiar authority of God, have in them a potency not pertaining to other ideas, that is when we really have faith that they come from God. And this explains to us what is meant by coming under the influence of the Holy Spirit. No one ever became spiritually-minded, apart from the teaching of the revealed word of God, and hence it must be truly said that "no man can call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Ghost"; for the Holy Ghost is the Revealer of Holy Scripture. What I say is, that the possession of the Divine Spirit is neither more nor less than the communications of God's truth received by the soul, as the principles by which it is to be guided. And as these communications are simply *ideas* in the first place, of which we are intellectually cognisant; so, associated as they are in their

Digitized by Google

origin and application as coming from God, they should create emotions of superior authority and efficiency over the inferior impulses of our constitution.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XIV.

ON THE QUESTION OF HUMAN FREEDOM.

THE question of human freedom has been a puzzling one; but why? Simply (I apprehend) because due distinction has not been made betwixt the *operation* of causation, and the *formation* of causation. The former has alone been attended to: the latter has not been regarded. Hence the deadlock in which inquirers have found themselves. They could not divest themselves of the feeling that they were free to will and to act, but when they have come to analyse the operation, *necessity* as a matter of course presented itself. It is to be noted that when *cause* is actually constituted, *effect* must necessarily follow; but it is equally observable that in the constituting or instituting, of cause, there is no inherent or *a priori* necessity. It is here therefore, that is in the *formation* of cause, that human freedom exists. If cause is not formed, of course causation cannot operate, for in that case there is no causation. The distinction, therefore, which I now refer to is of enormous importance in settling this ticklish question. In the operation of causation, we find what is simply the operation of law. Law is the established order of nature; law of necessity produces its own phenomenon, when

Digitized by Google

causation is fairly established. It cannot be otherwise. When ingredients happen to enter into a combination wherein they affect one another, it is a necessity of nature that a result shall be produced in precise accordance with the conditions of the ingredients and the relationship in which they are made to stand to one another. This is law; and law is the antecedent on which all phenomena depend. Were there no law there could not be a phenomenon. Law is the mainspring of phenomena. Law, indeed, is the term for the operation of causation.

A question here starts up, What is it which gives to law its peculiar function? What is it which gives a definite operative power in causality? I answer, it is *the relationship* in which two or more ingredients stand to one another, when they are combined so as to influence one another. Each ingredient contains its own quality or qualities, by which it is known and defined: every separate ingredient, therefore, in the causal combination forms a factor giving forth its own individual influence: the affinity which pertains to one quality in its attitude to another *initiates* the character of the movement, while the energy that pertains to all substance gives the *force* required by this affinity: the whole of the ingredients, therefore, when combined constitute cause: they are cause *quâ* the precise effect which arises out of the combination in question. Our own bodily constitution, for example, is a varied amount of particulars brought together, and we find a normal and constant result from day to day, when no change is made in the particulars, as for example, when the character of healthy food and exercise is ministered from day to day. But let there be the supply of a deleterious food,

Digitized by Google

and a change is effected. Here the altered food is very properly said to be the cause of the altered result as to health. And the obvious reason is, that while the ingredients of the constitution have each its share in the production of results, the altered conditions introduced are the direct cause of the altered results. The conclusion, then, we come to with respect to causation is that *every cause must be attended with its own effect.* Law imperatively demands that a phenomenon must of necessity be produced in accordance with the conditions involved and the relation in which the conditions are made to stand to one another.

So far it comes out that law is an inexorable power which cannot be turned aside from its precise and positive finding: but it is not with causation as an *operation* that we have to do in considering the question of human freedom; but with the principles which go to the *formation of causation:* this latter alone is the test as to the freedom of our wills and actions. Our wills and actions when once formed, come under the category of causation, precisely as all other cases of causation; for it is here to be understood, as elsewhere, that when once cause is constituted, the term freedom has no proper place in evading the consequence. Of course one may interfere with an existing cause; what then? Why, of course, in that case the law of causation demands that the interference shall operate according to the nature of the interposition in modifying the existing constitution of cause; but what is interference but the institution of cause *de novo;* and here we are brought direct to the question of freedom.

In what, then, does freedom lie, as touching the determinations of the human mind? I answer, *it lies in the*

Digitized by Google

power to form, or to check the formation of, any contemplated combination of the causal elements of will. And what are the causal elements of will? I answer, ideas. This can be made obvious by any number of examples. There is no will without ideas, because there is no motive without ideas; it is motive in all cases that begets will. When, therefore, a number of separate ideas come before the mind, each one creating a separate motive for the exercise of will, *it is in the power of the me to adopt* that which seems on the whole to be preferable to the others; in which case, free-will is sufficient to carry out volition in its behalf. Will formed, I have said, as a rule, depends on, and arises out of, secondary ideas. Secondary or indirect ideas have been already described in the preceding Excursus on the psychological problem: and may briefly be summed up as the ideas which arise in the mind under the motive-power created by primary or direct ideas. These secondary ideas, therefore, are of necessity the Ego's supervision of the primary ideas, and involve the *ought* or the *ought-not* as touching the line of action indicated by the primary ideas. Here it is we have freedom. The motive power aroused by the secondary ideas gives to the Ego the power, the freedom, of adopting or rejecting the motive prompted by the primary idea: consequently we get not only a clear insight into the all-important fact that we have the power of free-will, but (which is of exceeding moment in this controversy) the precise circumstances under which free-will belongs to us. This power of choice set up by the action of secondary ideas, is neither more nor less than the privilege we have of constituting the causation, under which will operates. It is always to be observed

Digitized by Google

that, when once the causality of will is constituted in the human mind, the causation therein operates as law, precisely as it does in other departments of the world's movements; but on that very ground it is obvious we shall never be able to settle the question of free-will, until we first understand under what circumstances will is produced, and can clearly trace its movement as a phenomenon to the source whence it hath arisen.

I have made it (I trust) tolerably evident that will comes from ideas, and that the will which constitutes the deliberate decision of the *me* comes through the operation of secondary ideas. I have pointed out that the ingredients of mind are ideas, and that ideas in the mind in causal relationship with the *me*, are the ingredients out of which will arises; and particularly, that secondary ideas, which involve a foreknowledge of the results attending the fulfilment of primary ideas, constitute the deciding or determinating power of the *me* in restraining or checking, in controlling or regulating, in short, of forming or forbidding the causality under which we have the operation of will. Hence freedom of will has been defined to be the self-determination of the Ego: some say the deciding to do as one pleases.

But however true such language may be regarded as expressive of the sentiment of freedom we possess, both the one expression and the other may be employed with very imperfect and inaccurate ideas respecting will. When philosophers speak of the self-determining power of the Ego, they have respect to a power of operation for which there is no analogy in the world,—a capacity of self-origination of which no account whatever can be given—a capricious kind of upstart impulse for which no adequate cause can be assigned. They make will in

Digitized by Google

these circumstances a *causa sui* which to my mind involves a contradiction.

Again, as to the freedom of the will being defined, an inclining as one pleases, the language has not proved satisfactory; for what distinction can we institute betwixt "willing," and "willing as one pleases?" Unquestionably confusion of thought has arisen from the want of due discrimination as to the separate momenta prevailing in mind in connection with the exercise of will. When two or more alternatives are before the mind, any one of which it is in his power to fulfil, the determination or decision he comes to, is called *his pleasure.* Hence to will as one pleases, implies a preference given to one alternative rather than another. But what is this but the choice of one idea rather than another, as the ingredient that shall enter into the causal combination out of which will arises. For example, I may have the purpose to paper my room, and half-a-dozen patterns may be exhibited to me. I can take but one of them, and after surveying all I am attracted by one in preference to the others, and that accordingly becomes my choice. Or again, in a case wherein there is the moral element, I may have in charge a relative having a severe local ailment, the removal of which I am bound to undertake, if the thing can be done. Three alternatives are placed before me: either the application of the surgeon's knife, or the application of some severe cautery, or to let the case alone, and allow the evil to run its fatal course. How shall I choose in the circumstances? I must first sufficiently get acquainted with each respective idea and the value of it before I can properly choose; but the case shews clearly the freedom of will in choosing what we regard

Digitized by Google

as best. This freedom, as I have said, lies in the formation of that causality out of which our wills and actions proceed.

I maintain, therefore, that this question of free agency may be definitely settled upon principles which cannot be gainsaid. The prerogative of man possessing what I have termed indirect or secondary or depending ideas, as the arbiters of right and of wrong,—the *arbiters,* I say, because a comparison of consequences is hereby set up, and the motive or emotion to pursue that which is best,—that which recommends itself most,—that which pleases most, prompts to the engendering of a decision. It may be that some carnal desire of headstrong power, will after all carry the determination against a better judgment: this only indicates the anomaly of a man who has become the slave of his passion, more than of his reason.

It has been thought a very difficult problem to expound the free agency of man in consistency with the work of the Holy Spirit on the soul, as a regenerating influence. I cannot see where the difficulty lies, if we rightly view the mode of the divine operation. Only let it be understood that God, in revealing His word, and consequently in bestowing His Spirit on us, *forces no man,* but *simply supplies those motives* which go to operate powerfully on the mind, when duly apprehended. If I may so express it, God simply lays His good things at our feet; and this, not only with the freedom on our part to lay hold of them or reject them, but as having in them that attraction which constitutes our best wellbeing. God supplies abounding motives to us, that we should appropriate what He offers to us; but beyond this, nothing! HENCE OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Digitized by Google

for the use, or for the refusal to use, these good things. If we receive them, and employ them as required, we have the advantage of them,—an advantage which consists in our being in greater harmony with Him, and in better preparedness for the glory of His abode: if we refuse them, we must take the consequences of being unfitted to dwell in His presence, and to be discharged into the limbo for which we are adapted. If I tell a man that he is a sinner, and that "the wages of sin is death," and that I have this message from God; and farther, that the gift of God is eternal life, and that this life is in Christ, and becomes ours when we receive Christ; and still farther, that a man cannot serve two masters, because in holding to the one, he must needs separate from the other, I lay upon him the responsibility of choosing his own destiny. Abundant motive power is given by the proclamation of the divine message to accept the terms of God; and if a man does so, surely the glory is ascribable to God, who hath revealed the terms, and who hath given the strong motives to embrace the terms, without which the man could do nothing; and if, on the other hand, the man should, because of some overweening propensity, dislike the call, and remain in his *own* channel of action, surely the responsibility of refusing the offer of God must be regarded as properly falling on himself. There is no collision in the least betwixt the agency of God and the free agency of man, therefore, when respect is had to the operations of the Holy Ghost on the soul. *All is conducted on the principles of law;* and in respect that man has the great prerogative of adopting the principles of action on which he decides to operate, according as these have been laid before him, so does

Digitized by Google

he freely frame or *constitute* the causality out of which his procedure flows, and out of which his own destiny is found.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XV.

ON THE FALL OF SATAN.

As to the fall of Satan and his angels, there is scarcely *data* assigned on which we may found the exposition of it; but we are far from regarding it as an inexplicable problem. It rests upon a different basis obviously from that on which the fall of man is to be explained. The fall of man, we have seen, took place in perfect consistency with the prerogative of freedom, which he enjoyed, *viz.*, that of making his choice; but this of course must be no less arrogated with respect to the fall of angels. Only there was this great distinction betwixt the former and the latter; in that man fell through the promptings of a deceiver, insisting that his lies were alone the truth; whereas angels fell in the full knowledge that they were running counter to God. Man indeed had received a knowledge of the divine requirement; but in his case one, pretending to be from God, and professing to state the true will of God, made an effort to stultify man; and this, in order to remove the check whereby man's conduct would have been otherwise regulated, in obedience to God. Unquestionably man was to be blamed in permitting this removal, on the ground that the thing required, being once implanted in his soul

Digitized by Google

by God, without any ambiguity, it ought not to have been allowed to be disturbed, or dislocated from his soul; and certainly not under any less authority than that of God Himself, who prescribed the requirement so decisively. We are then able to explain the process under which *man* fell, while we cannot exempt man from the blame which unquestionably is attached to his falling.

In regard to the fall of Satan the case is different: we have not probably all the data demanded to explain the precise process of the fact; and yet, when we are told that *pride* ruled in his heart, we have but to fill in the details, which explain *how pride may readily have arisen; and how, under pride, a refusal took place to fulfil the will of God.* We have but to inquire what pride really is; and under what circumstances it could arise in a creature having pure and holy tastes and tendencies. Satan, it will be allowed, was created with exalted prerogatives; prerogatives in respect of expansive knowledge, and in respect of extensive power—prerogatives, therefore, fitting him to rule and have sway among others. We have only to suppose, in these circumstances, the fact of a requirement being issued to Satan, to fulfil some humiliating office, wherein his exalted nature would feel abashed and offended, to see under what circumstances the spirit of pride would arise—to see under what circumstances a contest would arise in the bosom, whether he would submit to the indignity or ingloriousness (as it would be regarded) which was being thrust upon him. Here we can readily apprehend how a collision of sentiment might arise, and this might be necessary as a test of obedience to authority, when authority gave forth commands that were against the

Digitized by Google

humour of his nature. That a contest should thus for a time rage in the bosom, as betwixt the claims of authority on the one hand, and the claims of self-importance on the other, we can readily understand. One or the other impulse had of necessity to give way; and it became simply a question of the comparative strength of each. Is it not possible to see that Satan, knowing his power and glorying in his power, and perched on the stately pedestal of his own overweening self-importance, chose to defy authority, and, in so doing, secured the adhesion of many to his standard; and so there came a fall among the angels!

It may be asked, in these circumstances, why demands should be made by God endangering the fall of His creatures, and hazarding such sad consequences as attended or followed their downfall? The answer to that is (and the answer is all-sufficient) that *the authority of God must be regarded as absolute in the realm of creation—that creation has to be tried by counteractions, and must, in the face of all counteractions, give way to God's authority;* and that, therefore, a test of a crucial kind must be applied in order to secure that the divine authority shall be supreme under all conceivable drawbacks. The act of humiliation, therefore, to which Satan had to be subjected (it may have been in connection with some service in behalf of man, being one to test the absolute subjection of Satan to God, even as the call upon Abraham to slay his son, was a test of his obedience in very difficult circumstances), was more (we may believe) than Satan could stomach; so hoisting the flag of rebellion, the impulse for self-assertion prevailed, that is, the recoilment from the commanded humiliation prevailed.

Digitized by Google

And here lies the distinction betwixt the fall of Satan and the fall of man. The fall of Satan was sin against the direct authority of the Holy Ghost, as being a known and overt act of disobedience to an express command of God—an act, so to speak, challenging God to do His utmost and His worst: the fall of man was indeed sin, in that it culpably permitted the behests of the Holy Ghost to *escape* from the soul, but it cannot be regarded as an overt and open running counter to God by the soul. Satan permitted the motive which spoke of his own lordly position to prevail, against a motive that would sink him down under obedience: man having allowed the motive, which spake of his avoiding a certain tree, to be regarded as a delusion, permitted the promptings of the lower nature to have an undue ascendency, ruinous to the soul, in swathing it in the corruption of the flesh, and terminating it in death.[1]

[1] See additional observations in Excursus XIX.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XVI.

ON THE POSSESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

No small misconception prevails in the minds of many as to what constitutes the possession of the Holy Spirit. Some will have this prerogative to be nothing less than the Divine Personality actually taking up His abode in the human soul of the believer; and there are some who, not caring to define precisely what the possession of the Holy Ghost implies, will insist that the operation of the Holy Ghost on the soul is an independent work of God—wholly apart from the use of the means of grace by the partaker. Both these positions I believe to indicate mistaken views. The former will not bear analysis, for this reason, that if the Holy Ghost were to reside in our souls individually, in distinct personality, we shall be found (unwittingly it may be, yet not the less assuredly) proclaiming the doctrine not of one Holy Ghost, but of any indefinite number of Holy Ghosts, according as believers happen to be multiplied. Besides, in maintaining such a view, and carrying it to its legitimate consequences, we should be obliged to say that in these circumstances, believers have two personalities, the one the personality which properly belongs to himself as having an outward man and as

Digitized by Google

having the ordinary experience which belongs to himself as a denizen of this world; the other the personality which is not his own, but is what he conceives to be the separate and distinct personality of the Holy Ghost.

This view is far from being necessary, under any fair and obvious interpretation of Scripture; and cannot hold good under any rational aspect of the question, but rather refutes itself; and specially in this, that our personality must always be involved in what is called *the conscious me;* and assuredly it is the conscious *me* which constitutes our personality, whether we are spiritualised by the operation of Holy Ghost, or whether we are left to wander in the valley of worldliness. What I affirm is, that when we are in possession of the Holy Ghost, we are simply made partakers of the divine *nature*, not of the divine *person.*

But it may be asked, Where lies the distinction here? There is a clear and obvious distinction. When we become partakers of the divine nature we receive instruction in the divine principles revealed to us; and receiving these as true, and as emanating from God, they become our own, and as our own (*i.e.*, as principles which have been appropriated by us, when they were rehearsed to us, as having their source in God and their communication from God) they rule in our hearts; in which case we are said to be influenced by the Holy Ghost. Hence it is said, "no man can call Jesus Lord but by the Holy Ghost," a truth which becomes obvious enough to us, when we consider that it is only through the revelation of the Holy Ghost that we can know who Jesus is, or what Jesus is, as the foundation of our salvation.

Digitized by Google

And this view of the operation of the Holy Ghost is in perfect consistency with the sound view of the operation of mind and of will in all the ordinary features of our conscious being. I have laid it down elsewhere[1] (and as a principle in the philosophy of mind, this is all-important), that *all our emotions arise from ideas brought to bear upon the me*, and that out of emotions, as the exclusive motives which generate will, our active powers of mind are evolved. And what is meant by the term "principles of action" but this, that they are ideas introduced by the ordinary channels whereby thought is communicated to us, and out of which motive-power springs.

No doubt, as natural beings, we have all of us our respective dispositions, which natively belong to us as respectively the *me* or personality individually; and of course these respective dispositions will and do show their varied taste and tendency of operation, upon every occasion, when the same communications are made to the understandings of different persons; but that does not interfere with the fact now stated, because the emotion or generation of impulse is one thing, and the determination is another. The incipience or start is one thing, and the complexion of the will is another. There must be motive power before there can be the possibility of will. But one motive-power may be counteracted by another motive-power, begotten through the first motive-power, that is, through a foresight of results, and so prevent the first motive-power being turned into will and volition. The motive-power is a force arising from the impartation of an idea to the *me*. I look out of my window and see a stranger gathering flowers in my garden. I go out

[1] See Excursus on the Psychological Problem.

Digitized by Google

and inquire why he does so, having the intention to stop him; but he tells me he is authorised to do so by a member of my family, when accordingly my motive-power is quashed. Each motive-power must of course be characterised as a particular force, according to the kind of ingredients that happen to be in play, that is according to the kind of ideas which bear upon the *me*, as itself dispositioned in one way or another.

Our native dispositions will therefore shew their tendency, and so far their power, upon every occasion when the communications of the world are made to bear upon them. I say, *so far* their power; because, if under the discipline of the gospel, we have been brought to subdue the carnal nature, and by consequence to leave the soul free to admit the communications of the Holy Ghost, then of course these communications from the Holy Ghost, *i.e.*, from the Word of God, must of necessity create their own proper emotions, which emotions become the controlling powers of our minds. They come to us with the authority of God attached to them: they stand therefore in our bosoms as the maxims of God, as the principles which operate and prevail in the divine bosom, and which have been revealed by the Holy Ghost for our learning. Hence the law under which alone we have what is called the operation of the Holy Ghost. It is simple enough when duly understood. It implies no special exercise of force on the part of God: it leaves the mind and will of man in perfect freedom; and yet it is truly "God working in us to will and to do His own good pleasure".

The process can be fairly understood, when it is clearly apprehended, that He simply *lays down His own principles at our feet;* and He endues these, as carrying with

Digitized by Google

them inducing motives for our acceptance of them. There is always a powerful motive to cast out a viper, as a hurtful creature, when in the first place, we are taught that we are harbouring a viper in our bosom (and this is the emphatic instruction which first of all we receive from God). There is farther always a powerful motive to accept a valuable gift as offered to us, when in the second place, we are taught that said gift is the ground of our highest happiness; and this is the next instruction we receive from God. In these circumstances, then, we are properly said to have the operation of the Holy Ghost in our souls, first as a deterrent from sin, and second as an inciter of righteousness.

It is hence obvious that the operation of the Holy Ghost must be first of all in the Church alone, that is in that association of men who have agreed to receive the Scriptures as the inspiration of God; and consequently as the divine rule of their faith and obedience. There may be any number of Sectaries who are divided in their interpretation of the Scriptures; but let the denominations of Christians be ever so numerous, we cannot deny the possession of the Holy Spirit to the Church which receives the Scriptures. True it is, that an erroneous interpretation of the Scriptures cannot express the mind of the Holy Spirit; and of course it follows, that when deviations exist in this respect, alienations must exist from the mind of the Holy Spirit; still, as the mind of the Spirit of God is in the Scriptures, he who has the Scriptures, and who believes in the Scriptures, and who bows to the teaching of the Scriptures, must thus be in possession of the Holy Spirit. If they pervert that possession the more is the pity for them. A man may misunderstand the

Digitized by Google

Scriptures, and to that extent misuse the seed of the Divine word, so that *misshapen forms of God and of His Christ* are built up in their souls; at the same time, as it is through the Word alone that the Holy Spirit is received, it cannot for a moment be questioned that *so far as the divine truth, which comes through the Word, is in the soul, to that extent is the soul a partaker of the Holy Ghost.* If it be true, then, that the Holy Ghost hath, in the inspired writings of the Canonical Scriptures, given all revelation needful for the Church, and hath provided that these things should be made known to the Church by the reading and preaching of the Gospel, it is of unspeakable moment, while we are not warranted to expect any operation of the Holy Ghost, out of the Church, *i.e.*, apart from the Scriptures, as the charter of the Church, that we study to understand the Scriptures aright, that we seek, above all things, to have clear and correct views of divine truth. Thus shall we be truly endowed with the Holy Ghost.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XVII.

ON THE PROCESSES OF MIND,

AND ON THE GROUND AND SOURCE OF MORAL LAW.
(AN ABBREVIATION.)

(1) THERE is no naked intellectual soul as such, apart from all connection with a physical basis of subsistence. The physical basis in angels may be very refined as compared with the gross matter of our bodies; and so the physical basis of our souls are correspondingly refined compared with our bodies; but our souls require a physical basis to connect them with our bodies; and this refined physical basis constitutes the foundation, of which the intellectual part has the consciousness.

(2) It is the bodily structure, and more immediately the cerebral structure as founded on that of the body, which gives to the physical basis of soul its peculiarities, and fills that basis with the multitude of qualities and conditions of which the soul has experience; first as itself a representative of its own body; and second as enlarged by the accumulated impressions received by means of the senses: the intellectual or crowning part manifesting them in consciousness.

(3) There is therefore no such phenomenon as "pure reason" in a soul *per se;* nor is there so much as an innate idea in a soul *per se.* As regards the human

Digitized by Google

soul, it is begotten simply by means of the human body; and, similarly in every animal creature, its mental part as an individuality, with its disposition, is determined by the qualities and conditions thrown upon the physical basis (the etherial), and reflected in the intellectual.

(4) The foundation of all personality being in our bodies, as derived from our parents, there must of course be a correspondence of souls with the characteristics of our parents. Hence, we are by nature helplessly born with the characteristics of our parents; and there is no such thing as a separate and independent creation of souls by God for human bodies.

(5) God hath by creation laid the foundations of natural law. I do not here enter on the grounds of Divine operation, as inherently pertaining to Himself, but there can be no laws of nature apart from the works of creation. A law of nature may properly be defined to be, *the operation of affinity*, when two or more qualities are brought into such combination or contiguity, as to affect another thereby.

(6) Affinity is explained by saying that there is what may be called a blood-relationship betwixt the various qualities of substance. There being but one primordial substance, out of which all the various qualities of substance are formed, it follows as a necessity that there must be an affinity among them, as one and all derived from the self-same parent-substance; and here there must be the phenomenon of attraction in certain conditions, and the phenomenon of repulsion, when the conditions are made adverse to their natural junction with one another.

(7) The name given to primordial substance, as all-pervading, and infinitely pervading, is Ether. Ether

Digitized by Google

must needs sympathise with all created substance, in as far as all created substance is formed from it. Ether has the inherent attribute of energy; and the conformation of qualities and their conditions is the definite expression of that energy. Hence when, in the combination of what is called cause, one quality affects another, the expression of the energy is known as force.

(8) Force is of necessity characterised by the conditions which create it. It may be of the mildest possible form so as to be scarcely perceptible; or it may be of the most violent character, being always the measure of the particular affinity subsisting betwixt qualities differently conditioned.

(9) In creation, Force is first of all manifested in the physical department of substance (the etherial), as distinguished from the intellectual. It demands the Intellectual primarily to introduce qualities and conditions and to place them in due adaptation to one another; and force will variously operate in the physical, always until the physical shall come to be so constructed as to afford scope for the display of the intellectual.

(10) The intellectual is simply the crowning attribute which belongs to the physical; and is discovered solely and exclusively by what is manifested as the characteristic of souls. Hence, as we discover by means of physical phenomena, the fact of a universal Ether, the parent-substance of all limitations of substance (matter) in the physical world; so we discover by means of intellectual phenomena, the fact that this universal Ether is crowned with the attribute of intellectualism; and that it expresses the limitations of physicism, in those cases where scope is afforded for intellectual development.

(11) Intellectual development is called Mind. Mind

Digitized by Google

is the cognition by the intellectual side of soul, of ideas; while ideas are the impressions on the physical side of soul, received by means of the *external* senses from the external world, under the exercise of Attention; or they are the copies of impressions recalled by means of the *internal* senses from the inner storehouse of impressions, under the exercise of Reflection.

(12) The soul in the exercise of Attention, applies itself to external impressions; and in the exercise of Reflection, it applies itself to internal impressions stored up; and by means of Association, for which it has appropriate instrumentality in the cerebral apparatus, it is able to recall simple ideas for Memory and for Imagination and for Judgment; while it can also draw up parts and properties of ideas by Abstraction for assisting Conception and Reasoning. In all this series of operations the soul is for the most part Intelligent.

(13) But besides Intelligence, the soul has also Will. Will is created through emotions which come up as impulses or desires; and emotions are created by the presence of ideas on the *me*. An emotion becomes Will when there is no counter emotion to stay it, or counteract it. A counter emotion is excited when one recoils from the foreseen result of carrying out the primary emotion. Will, therefore, is always characterised by the idea out of which it is begotten in the *me*.

(14) Will is exercised in the field of morals, when the idea out of which it springs relates to the *wellbeing of a sentient creature*. And herein lies the foundation of morals: the domain of morals being characterised by any idea affecting the wellbeing of a creature capable of pleasure and of pain as cognosced by the *me*.

The foregoing paragraphs contain a *résumé* of the

Digitized by Google

principles by which I account for any force whatever—by which we have the establishment of law, and the operation of law in the world—by which also we enter on the domain of mind, and have the exercise of will—by which, moreover, we have the law of morals introduced. These principles are detailed more fully in Excursus XIII.; yet the question of morals is so important, and their source so little understood, that I hope to be excused dwelling somewhat on this point.

It is perfectly obvious that those ideas, which I have thus defined as moral, come to us precisely in the same way as others come; and like other ideas, they will arouse emotions, when brought to the *Ego* or *me*, precisely in accordance with the conditions of the *me* on the one hand, and the conditions pertaining to the moral idea itself, as brought to the *me* on the other hand.

The foundation of morals is thus sufficiently obvious—so obvious, indeed, that I do not see how it can be disputed. Some have laid it in sympathy, some in interest, some in utility, some in happiness, and it would be a wonder if morality did not in many respects correspond with these as principles more or less conducive to the good of man; but the difficulty attaching to each of these is, that it will not square in *all* points with any one of these departments. A principle must be found, which, comprehending these, where they are properly involved, is yet not restricted to any one of these; and that principle is the *true wellbeing of the creature.*

A man may ask, How am I to know the true wellbeing of the creature? He might as well ask, How am I to know black or white? Assuredly *the true wellbeing of the creature lies in the creature's possession and*

Digitized by Google

enjoyment of the prerogatives given to it by the Creator; consequently morality consists in not restricting the liberty of the creature, unless so far as the greatest good of itself, or of the community, demands interference; and therefore more directly, morality consists in supplying to the creature what is properly in our power to supply, in order to its best estate, if that creature should be at all dependent on us.

Coming, then, as moral ideas do to the intellect, even as other ideas come; and finding that *ideas generally* are but the impressions carried by nerve instrumentality, either by the external senses from the external world, or by the internal senses under association from the inner storehouse of impressions, we are in a position to account for the whole range of thought, wherewith the human mind may or can be occupied. There have been what are called "eternal verities" or "necessary truths," as for example such axiomatic truths as that "the whole is greater than its part," which verities have been regarded as the inherent maxims of Intellect *per se*. But in thus concluding, there is a grave oversight of the very grounds in virtue of which we acquire these verities. If we never had been in possession of a concrete whole, and of a part of that whole, as *facts of our experience*, how could we ever have laid hold of the verity in question? That the whole is greater than a part, is neither more nor less than a practical experience, that comes before us in the very exercise of perception. It is the same with any other axiom. Take, for example, the axiom—"Things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another". This is an eternal verity, no doubt; but who does not see that it is dependent on the term "things"? Where would the

Digitized by Google

verity be, apart from the "things"? Had there been no *things*—one for comparison with one another, there could have been no abstract affirmation or axiom at all, respecting them. Where in that case would have been the verity in question? Hence this follows with respect to *all truths:* we must have *a foundation in fact before any truth whatever can exist;* and hence also the only sound definition which can be given of truth. Truth I hold to be neither more nor less than *the exact representation of something original.* Before it is possible for any truth whatever to exist, there must have been a prototype of which truth is the copy. Were there no original, there could be no delineation of it. Truth is the exact report or representation of a pre-existing fact, even as falsehood is misrepresentation, distortion, caricature, according to the nature of the deviation. Truth is an image, a likeness, a portrait; and of necessity, by its terms, is a copy or facsimile of something, and implies the something which it adumbrates. Every affirmation must be regarded as lying in the category of truth or of falsehood. Even when we affirm respecting identity, and say a thing must be what it is, here is the declaration of that fundamental law, without which there could be no truth.

Whence comes this fundamental law? It is in the nature of things the first principle of reason. A fact comes before the mind. The mind receives it. It cannot but receive it. The senses confirm it. Conference with others confirms it. This is a question in which we have no alternative. Hence the very foundation on which truth rests. It is a foundation in respect of which we have no liberty, unless we transgress the very first principles of our being. And what is a present truth must be always

Digitized by Google

a truth, the facts and the circumstances being the same.

As to the operation of Will generally, I have, I trust, made it obvious that it invariably springs from emotions, which are properly spoken of as motives, there being no such phenomenon as will but what is created by a motive. And yet will must be distinguished from motive, in as far as we may frequently find emotions arising in our bosoms which do not become will. The distinction between emotions and will arises from the fact that there are very frequently counteracting emotions. As all emotions arise from the presence of ideas before the mind, so counteracting emotions arise from ideas brought up through the operation of the primary idea. I call that a *primary* idea which is directly submitted to the mind; I call that a *secondary* idea which is brought before the mind through the operation of the former; and this foresight of consequences not unfrequently creates a secondary emotion which crushes the primary emotion; and so the secondary emotion becomes will. A young lady on seeing a bird of beautiful plumage desired to have it stuffed and put on her bonnet as an ornament; but on second thoughts she said, No! for if the practice of thus wearing beautiful birds were to become common, they would be sure to kill them for that purpose. Hence the secondary motive became will.

And here we have an exemplification of moral law. As to *the operation of moral law* in the rational mind, as an active principle of will, I have already sufficiently indicated the process, as dependent on the emotions generated from what I have termed *secondary ideas.* It is of exceeding moment to understand the rise and use of secondary ideas, as envisaged under the full

Digitized by Google

apprehension of what I have called *primary ideas.* There is on subjects like these so much liability to misunderstanding, that at the risk of repeating somewhat the tenor of what has been already advanced, I must re-state what these are, how they come to be entertained, and what connected emotions they severally beget. Primary ideas, then, may generally be characterised as *those which represent the impressions directly received through the medium of the external senses*, and as a rule they may be termed *percepts*, though (it might be noted) they may come before the mind also in this character as mere *reminiscences.* All facts or events in this way are properly primary ideas, when entertained in the mind.

But all facts or events do not necessarily embrace secondary ideas. Such facts as a conclusion in logic, a Q. E. D. in geometry, or such events as the rising of the sun, or a change of ministry in some alien Government, when they are brought before us, stand by themselves in our mind, and beget no secondary ideas. They may indeed, as any idea may, be associated with something else; but what I call a secondary idea, is a foresight of results when a primary idea affects self, or any creature susceptible of pleasure and pain. For example, all facts relating to the wellbeing of self, or of those in whom we are particularly interested, involve what we call secondary ideas; and these produce emotions of the strongest sort. Though we are not particularly interested in them, yet when certain facts interfere with the proper prerogatives of a creature that may be affected by them, the character of the affection is the secondary idea, which brings up an emotion correspondent to the interest we feel in the object; or if we have little or no immediate

Digitized by Google

interest in the object, yet an emotion correspondent to the kind of feeling to which the creature is subjected. The outward fact, then, may be termed the primary idea: the particular person or creature as affected by said fact, is termed the secondary idea. *It is out of this, the secondary idea, as a rule, that the emotion of morals is developed.* For example, I hear the information that a large stone has fallen from a chimney-top: the abstract fact affects me very little, or not at all. But when I hear that it is occasioned by a rent in the house of the proprietor, I feel a little for him: when I hear that the stone has fallen on a dog and injured him, I am moved somewhat in sympathy for the injury which the dog has received: when I hear that it has fallen on a child I am increasingly moved, in as far as a child is more valuable than a dog: when I hear it has fallen on a man my sympathy is increased still more; and if the man is the father of a family dependent on him, my feelings are still more affected: and if I hear that the person injured is an immediate relation of my own, my emotions are excited in proportion to the interest I feel in him or the love which I bear to him. The sentiment and feeling brought out are throughout *moral*, in as far as a creature, susceptible of having its normal estate disturbed, is affected. We see, then, not only the direct origin of what is called moral discernment, but also the source of its character. Moral law or conscience is the emotion that is aroused through this discernment, to repair as far as in us lies the injury that has befallen the creature or person that is hereby made to suffer.

The case in which we are involved may pertain to an object of personal desire, in order to serve one's personal ends. In these circumstances some people

Digitized by Google

have not, or do not seem to have, much conscience of their own, when prosecuting their course; and the reason is, that the object sought for, *i.e.*, the primary idea, is so paramount in their eyes—that is, so desirable—as to be a thing to be attained at all hazards, no matter what pain it may occasion to others. *We* who look on, however, as impartial spectators, are indignant. Ahab made a proposal to Naboth to get his vineyard by purchase. There was nothing wrong in this. Had Naboth agreed to the proposal, the transference of the vineyard to Ahab had been a fair transaction; but when Naboth would keep his vineyard, the forceful taking of it by Ahab affected him injuriously, and was therefore an immoral act. What alone would make such an act not immoral would be its necessity for a public good; but then abundant compensation is required. Now, when we find that the man was put to death that Ahab might take possession, a feeling of indignation is aroused; that is, our conscience is aroused to condemn such conduct; that is, the primary idea (*viz.*, the vineyard in the mind of Ahab involving the emotion of taking possession of the vineyard) being accompanied with, or involving, the injury hereby inflicted on its owner: the foresight of this injury, as the wrong done to another, generates the secondary emotion in the question; and this emotion thus secondarily aroused, is what we call *conscience*. Hence the value of conscience as an intercepter of action, or as a controller of action, when we contemplate the performance of any function. The emotion to the performance of any function is initiated from the primary idea; but the foresight of the creature as affected by the performance, is the secondary idea; and this secondary idea begets an

Digitized by Google

emotion of its own, that may interfere with the performance. A man may, like David, desire to have his neighbour's wife, but there is a restraint laid upon him against attempting to fulfil that desire, *viz.*, the injury which he would thereby inflict upon another. The idea of injury to the sensitive object is the secondary idea; and it is this which gives rise to an emotion which should go to check or modify the desire created by the primary idea.

Moral will, then, being the emotion which is created by the presence and by the application of *a moral idea*, we may rest satisfied as to what constitutes the precise foundation of morals. There seems to me nothing more certain, nothing more precisely determined, than this basis out of which morals spring. As emotion or motive is always, and without exception, created by ideas, and as every emotion is dependent on two things, *viz.*, *the condition of the Ego or Me* to which the idea is brought, and *the character of the idea itself* as falling on the *me;* so moral emotions, that is emotions involving feeling in respect of human conduct, *as applicable to a sentient creature*, are the result of moral ideas. And these must always vary in our judgment according to the standard of right which we may happen to have acquired. The perfect standard is in the Scriptures.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XVIII.

ON MAN AS CREATED: MAN AS FALLEN: AND MAN AS RESTORED.

It is of unspeakable importance that we should be able to see what is the precise condition of *man fallen* as compared, or rather contrasted, with *man created;* in order that we may see what is the true condition of *man restored.* The condition of man created, I should think, must needs be in the first place, that of a soul individualised or personified into a conscious *me*, by reason of the living body through which each soul comes into being. Analogy would certainly propound this. We have the whole animal creation manifesting this very characteristic; and if man stands at the head of the animal creation, and forms its climax and its close, man too must have his intelligent nature first of all formed in dependence on, and conformity to, the instrumentality, which is demonstrably the medium through which the intelligence operates, and whereby it is measured and graduated. I do not for a moment yield to the notion, that the Creator did not Himself personally interpose, in order to the formation of man. I do not admit that when man came upon the stage, he was a mere creature of evolution; and that in and

Digitized by Google

through the struggles of what has been regarded as "aspiring nature," he acquired faculties so much in advance of all inferior creation. I do not think that this was possible; and for two reasons.

The first is, that the law of causality could not admit of such a phenomenon as that of man, out of the ingredients pre-existing in any of the creatures already in being. Causality can present such phenomena only as are in conformity to the ingredients which are assembled to constitute the effect. Wherein, then, I must ask, came to man these powers of reason, in virtue of which he is able to see and to know the wants of the *not-me*, and to provide for them,—those wants particularly which the inferior creation are unable to see, and which, having regard to the wellbeing or best estate of the creatures around, form the foundations of moral law in man? This tremendous *hiatus*, betwixt man and the lower animals, in their most advanced condition, required the special interposition of the Creator, and without which the human prerogative could not have been supplied.

The second reason, against the theory of evolution, is the fact that, in the admitted changes which do take place in the varied development of species, there must needs be a natural limitation to the circle of their extension. All experience shews that human improvement lies within a circle of limitation: yes! though man has *the head and the hand* of a rational being full of inventions. It may be said that the head and the hand of rational man are the fundamental agency at work, in the ordinary rise and progress of things in the world, that is in their evolution, without the interposition of a Creator; but *man is de facto the creator in regard to these inventions;* for creatorship by man is seen in the

Digitized by Google

introduction of some specially *new* elements, whereby a machine is improved, and is enabled to do other and different work from what it did before. In evolution there is merely a *modification of existing forms*, according to the use and treatment which these forms have received; and in that modification, the influences, which have been brought to bear upon them, will sufficiently account for the change; but evolution cannot introduce forms that are absolutely *new*, that is, forms the very germs of which did not before exist in the category.

Hence, in bringing man upon the stage of existence, I argue, that it was absolutely necessary that there should be the special interposition of a Creator—interposition in modifying and improving the structure of his body, and more especially in introducing and arranging new parts pertaining to the structure of his brain; so that the said structure might be a sufficient instrumentality to bring out not only a mind capable of discerning the wants of others, but also of reasoning and judging as to what is true and right. But there is not, and never was, any necessity for the Creator separately to manipulate what constitutes a human soul, as separated from the human body; in as far as every soul behoved and behoves to be in precise conformity to the body with which it is associated. Hence I say, if to the instrumentality of mind there are added elements which are absolutely new, it behoves that man must come forth having a form of mind with prerogatives absolutely *new* —prerogatives which no mere deviations, through the operations of experience, could by possibility have begotten.

But though the condition of man betokens the special interposition of a Creator in order to his formation, it

Digitized by Google

does not follow that the Deity did not build up man on a pre-existing plan. All analogy shews most clearly that He did. And while as regards the outward structure, whereby man might best perform the operations of intellectual manipulation required by a rational creature, the outward structure of the ape, no doubt, formed the most suitable, while it behoved that an accession to the instrumentality of brain should be *de novo* introduced, which no natural development could by possibility ever have produced and set up.

In the creation of man, therefore, we can observe this much, that, while a pre-existing form, as a fundamental type, had to be employed and built upon, it behoved that there should be the special introduction of a fresh equipment of brain, not found in any pre-existing type. Man, however, could, as to his mind, be nothing other than what this new instrumentality constituted him, as to the native character of his mind. Formed on the basis of a certain definite fundamental organisation, in virtue of which the human mind was manifested as rational, it was certain of course that man should hereby have a higher intelligence than any creature before him. It was possible for man, in the first place, as a creature of moral law, to fulfil its behests, a course impossible for any creature before him; but these behests were of necessity inadequate for his perfection, in that they must fail to contribute to spirituality of thought. For the world around him could not always secure that fulness of knowledge, in virtue of which the moral nature, thus introduced, should always operate accurately without committing mistakes—mistakes through ignorance alone. Man as a creature formed in subordination to the body of the flesh, might be able to envisage the fact of his

Digitized by Google

Maker; and under the conditions in which the carnal nature existed, without any tendency to excesses, man might be perfectly able and competent to fulfil the demands of moral law as natively the highest law of his being, and without doubt he did so; but with all this, for want of sufficient intelligence in many of the arrangements of life, he must, while acting in perfect conformity to his moral nature, commit many misjudgments so long as he was in ignorance.

Hence it behoved that man, in order to his perfection, should have the special instruction of God from time to time, as he needed it. This was a necessity in order to his reaching the destiny of an immortal being. It was a necessity in order to the implantation in his soul of the seeds of a life far higher than earth could introduce. The experiences of earth could bring about what may very properly be called the higher development of man through increased experience and knowledge of earthly things, even as we now find man distinguished in type and character over the face of the earth; but *man could never have been, of himself, linked on to a higher world, i.e.*, a spirit-world, by any process of natural development. It was necessary, therefore, *that the sentiments of the higher world should be communicated to him.* These sentiments—the sentiments which reign in the bosom of God—form the basis of the soul's immortality. In order to the establishment of this condition, of course it was needful that moral law should be in free and easy operation, in which case alone, man could be in a condition to receive the instructions of God. The instructions of God constituted the foundation of a new nature in as far as they prescribed a *new motive* for the exercise of will, and consequently for a rule of conduct beyond

Digitized by Google

what was naturally attainable by man, when left to himself. Hence this instruction, as it came to be gradually enlarged, laid in man a new basis on which *the formation of a spiritual character* arose as the preparative for a higher and nobler state of existence than the platform which earth afforded, or could by any possibility have supplied. So much for the created condition of man.

I inquire now, what constituted the condition of *fallen* man fundamentally? I answer at once *the changed condition and attitude of the soul to God, and to the carnal part, as now exclusively operative on the soul.* Man, let it be observed, was made a very complex machine, of very delicate texture; and the slightest deviation from the integral state in which he was found and placed, would tend to disturb the free and sound operation of his constitution, as a creature preparing for spiritual elevation; for it never was and never could be, intended, that the crowning condition of man was reached when he was made simply a creature of the earth earthy, though gifted with a rational nature. But really to beget, or to induce what is properly regarded as a *fallen* condition in man, there must needs come to be an unauthorised junction and application of the province of the flesh, as a power on the soul; and this such, that it no longer worked in harmony with the instructions of God. The instructions of God supplied, for the purposes of moral law, requirements which the intelligence of man, left to himself, could not achieve; and if the inferior nature, that is, the desires that emanated from the body of the flesh, should come to run counter to these instructions, there was an end to all harmony of man with his Maker. The process, then, whereby man came to fall must be made obvious. That process has

Digitized by Google

been discussed; and in that process we have seen how the spiritual conviction was eviscerated, and how the desires of the carnal part (the flesh) were permitted an operative influence, when it should have been otherwise; seeing that positive instructions to the contrary were given by God. Hence the beautiful and delicate balance and adjustment in which man was made, became deranged, and the precise arrangement whereby harmony was secured with his God no longer existed. The flesh came to operate on the soul in excess; and of necessity precluded thereby what has been called the operation of the Spirit, that is, it obstructed the instructions of God. The instructions of God, indeed, as *the basis of true righteousness in man*, would not alight on a soul, as already soiled with, and defaced by, the colouring of the flesh,—a colouring which gave to the soul an affinity only for earthly things and an attraction for the things of itself. This state of soul was subversive of its immortality. This state of things came, however, to be propagated in the creature man,—a state of things in which the excesses of the carnal part predominated; and what thus pertained to the parents, as a condition of carnal predominance, was thus engendered in the race through ordinary generation; and this condition is simply what the Apostle calls "the flesh of sin," *i.e.*, the flesh which engenders or produces sin.

In this condition man is of necessity now born; it is a state of sin. And we see how. If the soul takes on the complexion of the carnal part first of all, and that carnal part is in excess, the soul can have an attraction —that is, a taste and a tendency—only for that which forms its native condition, as thus made carnal; and, of course, therefore, it can in these circumstances have

Digitized by Google

no taste for spiritual things, that is for things which would go to curb, or even to destroy, the carnal element. The complexion of the thinking part of man, therefore, of necessity came to be carnally developed in disposition, and variously, according to the different characteristics of the flesh, temper being slow or quick, obstinate or wayward, according as these prevailed in the flesh. Hence a readiness to irritability and anger in one; while in another there would be a sluggishness to emotion, according to the conditions of the carnal part, and to the influences brought to bear upon these. In the very nature of things, the soul could show no other complexion than what must needs arise from the very medium in which it had been primarily bathed, and with which therefore it must be conjoined in the unison of co-partnery. Hence, if the conditions of the bodily system are in excess for acquisitiveness, *i.e.*, for the gratification of its own cravings, the soul must needs participate in, and take to, that excess, and sympathise with the imperious *exactions* (what the apostle calls δόγματα) which have their root in the flesh. It must always be borne in mind that the intellectual element, that is the attribute of soul out of which intellection is derived, must always and of necessity partake of the precise forms presented to it, and be characterised by these. If filled with these forms (ideas) having their source in the flesh, of course it must be carnal; and, again, if filled with impressions having their source exclusively from the world, of course it must be worldly. The soul thus formed, having as its crowning attribute, only the intrinsic property of intellectualism, must needs take on that form or characteristic of consciousness with which it happens to be imbued from the particular source which it intel-

Digitized by Google

lectually represents. And although the rational nature must needs shew that it involves moral discernment, when the wellbeing of the creature, as affected by ordinary operations, comes up into consideration; yet how weak as well as imperfect must moral law be in these circumstances: first, because of the persistency of the carnal nature for its own selfish demands; and, second, from the want of instruction also as to the evil effects of their gratification; and, third, from the want of a higher authority needful to support the small amount of existing moral discernment. Man left to himself must, as thus constituted, go far astray, and be unfitted for immortality.

It is only, then, *when we apprehend how man is made a sinner, that we can at all understand how he can become a saint, i.e.*, how he can be redeemed or delivered from the power of sin; and brought not only to partake of the things of God, but to be in a state of unison and harmony with God. It is obvious there must be *a reversion of the operation whereby man fell;* that is, an influence must be brought so strongly to bear upon the natural and fallen condition as to disturb its carnal complexion and to remove the same from being any longer the essential habitude of the soul. Then only can the soul come into a condition for the direct reception of the things of God. The process may be compared to the restoration of the painting on our doors. The process involves in the first place the *removal of the old painting*, by the application of a heated plate, when only it becomes more easily separated from the wood to which it has been so long attached; and then, *when the surface is thus cleansed, is it fitted for receiving the new coat*, whereby the door becomes freshly beautified and

Digitized by Google

adorned. Jesus Christ shewed the practical fulfilment of the process, in that, having taken the body of our flesh, He, by the Spirit which dwelt in Him, was able to restrain the applications of the flesh and to mortify the very springs of carnal power—in short to "blot out the handwriting" of carnal things from the soul, things which war against the true interests and spiritual well-being of the soul; and at the same time, clothing the soul with the principles of divine righteousness, He was able to introduce into the world that new man which after God is created in the perfection of righteousness and of holiness. *The restoration of man* consists in his being so operated on, as to be thus formed after the likeness of Christ; and for this, two saving graces are given to him, Repentance for the removal of sin, and Faith for the application of righteousness.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XIX.

ON THE CONDITION OF UNCLEAN SPIRITS, AND THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

THE condition of "unclean spirits" is essentially the condition into which those are brought who have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost; for this betokens a soul overtly running counter to what may be called the law of Divine Knowledge. When the law of knowledge has reference to some positive command or requirement of God, and remains impressed on the mind as a divine requirement, and is not forgotten for the time as an injunction of God; and when we are found with all this, knowingly and deliberately running counter to God, we are in the condition of devils: we are committing the sin against the Holy Ghost. It is easy to see why it is called the sin against the Holy Ghost. There could be no such sin, if the Holy Ghost were not given: when the righteousness of God is revealed to the soul, and we know that the principles involved therein are from God, and do form the principles which operate in the bosom of God, they bring along with them motives strong and stringent, why we should be animated by them and conformed to them, so that they may be carried out in the practical conduct of life. But when enmity to these hath so got hold of our

Digitized by Google

hearts, as to become the fixed and immovable character of our souls; and when through this enmity, we are found daring to oppose ourselves to God, then are we found committing the sin against the Holy Ghost. The devils have the instruction of God: they have the light of heaven upon their souls, and this constitutes the very furniture of their souls; but they are so perverted fundamentally: hence, whatever light in that way comes home to them, that light, instead of having a motive-power as the law of righteousness, is manifested in direct contravention of that law.

It will be seen, then, that *the fallen condition of man is not natively that of the unclean spirits.* The fallen condition of man is what is properly called *a carnal state* of mind, in contrast to a *spiritual state*—a state of what is called *death*, because it is a state without God—a state in which the flesh reflects its own complexion on the soul, in which, therefore, the impulses of the flesh have their free and unrestricted play upon the soul, and in which the soul yields obedience thereto; while as a rule, the impulses which come from the Spirit of God, that is from instruction in divine principles, are wanting. This is what is called "loss of communion with God," and the consequent want of divine righteousness upon the soul.

But though the fallen condition of man is readily distinguishable from the fallen condition of the angels who have become "unclean spirits"; yet in certain circumstances the fallen condition of man may lead to that of unclean spirits, *i.e.*, when man in his soul becomes allied to these, and in fact becomes one of these. This can only be under divine teaching, and in resistance to divine teaching. Let a man be without any divine

Digitized by Google

teaching, and he is of course without any divine law; and if he is without any divine law he cannot of course transgress that law. He cannot knowingly run against a law which he has never received. As our Lord says, "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin". Consequently though a poor heathen may be utterly destitute of those elements which alone give a title to heaven, and a preparation for heaven, and consequently have no means of attaining to heaven; still he is without those, on the other hand, which mark a knowing, positive and overt transgression of the divine law. Hence, if heaven cannot be his portion, so neither can hell be his portion; and if it be true that "God alone hath immortality," and that our immortality follows from our being "in Him," *i.e.*, through our receiving the seeds of the divine life which pervade his bosom, then as Paul says, "they that are without law shall *perish* without law," there being nothing in them that can infer, much less confer, life eternal. The knowledge of God gives eternal life.

How, then, may a man slide into the condition of spiritual uncleanness? I answer, when the requirements of God are clearly made known to him under divine authority, and when he comes into that condition, wherein he not merely disregards these, but *contravenes* them. The case of the Jewish priests and rulers afford an illustration of persons sliding into the sin against the Holy Ghost. They had got so wedded to their own false system, handed down by tradition from their fathers, that they would not brook any intermeddling therewith to upset the same. Accordingly when Christ came, and by evidences unquestionable of His Divine mission as a prophet of God, taught them doctrines which they

Digitized by Google

could not but know came from God, yet they refused to receive them: they set their face against them: and instead of allowing the claims of Jesus so clearly revealed to them, they perverted the truth and said that He was in league with devils, and that "He cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of devils". Christ had shewn very distinctly His own absolute antagonism to devils, and to the principles of devils; and when, in the face of clear and definite instruction which had been vouchsafed to them, they perverted the revealments of God, into emanations from Satan, they became unclean to the things received by them. The law of righteousness became in their souls the law of unrighteousness.

The process under which this dreadful state is reached, it is not very difficult to ascertain. It happens, it can happen, only in circumstances where the soul has become resolutely fastened to some favoured line of its own. There are cases in which, after long training to some acknowledged scheme of thought, it may be the standards of a church whose prosperity we have much at heart, whose tenets we have long held as being infallibly certain, that when evidence comes of some special fallacy, we yet after all refuse to give this up; and not only so, but do contradict and rail at him who bringeth in better things,—things that are manifested as coming from God. In short, when for the sake of maintaining and propagating our own dogma, we deliberately run down and depreciate the very truth of God.

Hence the danger of holding to any earthly object with a tenacity which will not brook our separation therefrom; and the danger lies in the tendency to tell an untruth, lest our darling should be taken from us.

Digitized by Google

Whether it be to get hold, or to keep hold, of some coveted privilege, some will be found prevaricating the truth. It may be that a man is anxious above all things to conceal his shame, that he may stand well in the world, he tells a lie for this purpose; and this very state of mind constitutes that deterioration of character which gradually slides into a ready facility not merely to equivocate, but to misstate facts, and to be directly false; and by an easy gradation to perjure one's self to serve a desired end. This latter, I hold, is an *entrance* into the sinfulness which, when matured, constitutes the sin against the Holy Ghost.

It seems obvious enough that this is a state which cannot be reached all at once, and which can be brought about only through a training in deceitful ways. It may be that, under circumstances, when some strong prepossession has got hold of a man who is under the blind impulse of its power, he, like the Apostle Peter, will boldly utter a lie, or what he knows to be a lie; but if his soul hath not been seared by the perpetration of such contradictions with himself, he too will readily, like Peter, be brought to repentance, when he will behold his deed with horror, and the sin will thus be forgiven; yes! forgiven, because blotted out.

But it is a dangerous state of soul, when a man can carry about a deliberate lie, and cherish it in his own bosom; for, in that case, he will repeat it when occasion offers; and this is the path by which a man comes to sin against the Holy Ghost—the path by which he comes to run counter to the thoughts and demands expressly revealed by the Holy Ghost, and therefore to come into the category of devils. It is not necessary in order to this, that a man be inclined to horrid

Digitized by Google

cruelty; the fact of his knowingly perverting the truth of God, and making a stand against what he knows to be the truth of God, is, when persisted in, a falling into the department of devils; it indicates an "unclean spirit," or that state which is the sin against the Holy Ghost.

It may be asked, if Satan and the rebel angels were once pure and holy spirits, how was it possible for them to become the contrary? How was it possible for them to become impure and unclean? How was it possible for them to run counter to the very law of their being? It may be said that their case was very unlike that of man, who was created with something of a double nature,—a nature in which the soul was on the one hand instructed by God, and had therefore the inclination, as instructed, to obey God: a nature also in which the soul was acted upon by the bodily constitution, and which (as was the case with man) might be incited to go into excess in gratifying its claims; it may be said that angels had not an inferior constitution like man's operating upon the mind, and which had to be controlled by the superior instincts of their being: it may be said that the nature of angels was simple in this respect, that their spiritual bodies and souls were in perfect oneness and harmony with God in immortality, and no impulse arising from the former which had to be controlled by the latter. How then, it may be asked, could angels thwart the very law of their being? Is there a case in which law is no longer law, in which a thing is not what it is, in which a thing can be different from itself, whether something static, or something operative?

I have no doubt that a satisfying answer can be given, by which we can understand by what process

Digitized by Google

angels could have fallen, and may have fallen, from their purity. God had only to enjoin what would be disagreeable for them to do, in which case the injunction or law of authority must needs stand in opposition to the law of native sentiment and feeling. Hence a clear case of collision in respect of motive-power to will. Suppose, for example, that Satan and his companions had been called to the discharge of certain functions which were essential in behalf of other departments of creation, but which they regarded as much beneath them,—functions which were against the grain, yet, after all, functions which were properly assigned to them for other reasons, in that they were to be a test of their absolute submission in all things to the absolute authority of their Creator, is it not obvious, that in these circumstances, there must be a direct antagonism of law —a clashing, inferring the sacrifice of their own will, on the one hand; or by a maintenance of their own will, on the other hand, inferring therewith a contravening of the authority of God. The moment we can see the possibility of a collision of this sort, we see the possibility of a fall. There is thus placed before us, the law of superior authority versus the law of personal repugnance; it is not, therefore, difficult to see the principle on which resistance to authority was offered, as involving an escape from experiences which were unpleasant or distrustful. Resistance had only to be persisted in so far, when it would break forth into open rebellion.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XX.

ON THE PROCESS WHICH LEADS TO REGENERATION.

THERE is a feature which cannot be too strongly insisted on in order to understand what constitutes the Regeneration of man. Man is now born under the sway of "sinful flesh": his soul is natively clothed with its characteristics, and must needs echo and manifest these intellectually: hence the life of the soul is properly what is called "the life of the flesh," and naturally is antagonistic to inimical principles which go to destroy that life. Hence, therefore, how true "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God". What then has to be done in order to bring man into a state of receptivity for the things of God, that is, what has to be done in order to give to man the power of faith? One thing only could be done preliminarily, and that is to operate on the sinful element, *i.e.*, on the carnal condition. This it is which is the difficulty; this it is which is the painful part of the process: this it is which is called "cutting off a right hand or plucking out a right eye": this it is which materially disturbs natural disposition and tendency; and the mind will submit to it only when assurance is conveyed to it, that there is a grievous danger attending the maintenance of its present condition, and that a new and permanent life would be

Digitized by Google

evolved by undergoing the sacrifice of the old. This process, however, involves nothing less than the destruction of what is called one's natural life; for it is the breaking up of one's natural tastes and tendencies. It is of necessity the repression and mortification of those impulses, which have their root and spring in the body; for, in order to their abandonment, the craving which they induce has to be denied.

And how is this process of self-denial to be entered on, for the very law of our natural being is to satisfy its cravings, and to foster the indulgence of them? Can it be done by merely telling a man to receive contrary principles? We may tell a man to be pure in heart, but if he is swallowed up in debauchery, our advice takes no hold of his mind; he hears it as he would an idle tale, because another and a deeper engagement absorbs him. But if you can assure him that a certain indulgence will bring ruin to him, the very love of life, which operates as the strongest propensity of our nature, will make him pause and consider whether the gratification, arising from the present indulgence, can be regarded as a compensation for the coming destruction which the indulgence brings. It is in this way that a motive-power is introduced, which, however painful, goes to make a sacrifice of the existing dissipation. True it is, that said sacrifice could hardly be rendered if two things are wanting; first, the knowledge of the evil, and the danger of cherishing and indulging it; and second, the knowledge of another and a better life, as involved in the motive-power to subdue the evil. It is only under such circumstances that a direct assault can be made upon the life of the carnal element.

Digitized by Google

Hence in the economy of God, the first thing is, not to introduce immediately a dispensation of *faith*, but a dispensation of *repentance*—not to introduce a dispensation for at once building up the new man, but a dispensation for breaking down the old man—not a process to introduce the purely Christian dispensation, under which we put on Jesus Christ, and are clothed with his righteousness, but a process to begin with the principle in the Mosaic dispensation, as a dispensation of sacrifice, under which we are taught by the death of the victim "made sin," to be put to death in respect of our sin. That ground-characteristic of the legal dispensation necessarily had for its object the denunciation of sin, and therefore propounded the inexorable principle of *death to sin.* But death to sin might be the extinction of the individual if his soul was made up of nothing but sinful elements; hence the process of a gradual renunciation of sin, and therewith a gradual renewal in righteousness, in order to a man's regeneration. And hence, while the Mosaic dispensation has been *first* introduced, in order to teach the preliminary necessity of making the sacrifice of sin; and introduced, too, with many figurative illustrations calculated to teach the heinousness and hatefulness of sin, and this, moreover, preparatory to a due understanding and appreciation of the Christian dispensation, as having its crowning work in clothing the soul with the righteousness of God, it is obvious enough that, *now both dispensations must be classed in direct succession under one grand process, viz.*, THE DYING TO SIN IN ORDER THAT WE MAY LIVE UNTO RIGHTEOUSNESS.

To serve this principle there are two "saving graces" which must be exercised by us, *viz.*, Repentance and

Digitized by Google

Faith, the former being the operation whereby *sin is discharged*, and the latter the operation whereby *righteousness is received.* John the Baptist, as the Representative of the Law, could only preach the baptism of repentance; but when John was taken out of the way, *Jesus Christ took up the whole theme*, the theme, too, which He had embodied in His own life and teaching: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth by itself alone: but if it die it beareth much fruit". If it be not deposited in the earth it remains as it was; no change is effected in it, but if it be sown in the ground, a change takes place; and the change begins by destroying the character of the seed as it was in the soul, so as by-and-by to leave it, in a sense, an empty husk, yet in this very process of destruction, whereby the old grain is sacrificed, the germ of a new life starts the process of a new life, and a new life springs up, abundant in fertility and worth. This well describes the character, not of the Old Testament dispensation alone, nor of the New Testament dispensation alone, but of both dispensations unified in one grand scheme, whereby there is a *self-abnegation* on the one hand of what is our own, and a *self-appropriation* on the other hand of what is Christ's. And Jesus Christ Himself is the perfect exemplification of this great process, by "being put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the Spirit".

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XXI.

ON THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD IN THE PROCESS OF ATONEMENT.

So much exposition is to be found in this volume on the great question of Atonement, that it seems here unnecessary to enlarge to any extent. The fundamental principles (it is believed) are contained in the chapters on the Recovery of Man, and the Excursus on the Nature of Atonement, to an extent that should sufficiently commend themselves to any man's understanding and conscience. In such a question the revelations of Scripture must needs be interpreted by the dictates of our common reason and experience. If a fellow-creature is wronged, two questions obviously present themselves. The first is this—*Is it possible to repair the wrong?* The second is this—*What is needful to make the repair complete?* He who repairs the wrong is said to make atonement. The question of atonement is one which admits of clear and precise definition. Without precise definition we can discuss no question whatever to advantage; and this is a reason why we so often wander in mazes, and beat about a point, instead of striking the nail at once. All, then, that is implied in atonement, as regards man before God, lies in the *taking away the evil* which naturally characterises him, and in

Digitized by Google

substituting for the evil a good in harmony with God Himself and satisfactory to God.

God Himself is the Arbiter of good and evil: He loves the one and hates the other. God made man good, that is, in harmony with Himself; and man became evil, and as such offensive to God. God's disposition *always remains the same*, and it is of necessity a disposition antagonistic to evil, and reconciled to good. *There is no change of mind on the part of God, by a process of atonement.*

The whole question of Atonement, therefore, hangs on the reconcilement of man to God, that is, on the removal of the enmity to God, that naturally lies in the human bosom; and on the introduction of righteousness by substituting righteousness for unrighteousness — that righteousness which, as coming from God Himself through Jesus Christ, is acceptable to God; and which, operating as the motive-power of the human heart, constitutes the regeneration of the soul. *Regeneration therefore involves atonement*, and embraces in it the grand prerogative of divine mercy. The prerogative of God in the matter of mercy is this, that when once the offence is removed, and the heart is cleansed, God will lift no hand for punishment. There is no such thing as a penalty or punishment overtaking a regenerated man. Where sin is, of course there must be a visitation for sin, because God cannot embrace sin; but when sin is put away, then the enmity to God is taken away; and God can receive His creature as thus having a capacity and taste for the righteousness of His own holy nature. And this work of putting away sin is rightly ascribed to the purifying power of the blood of Christ, that is, to the living agency of His Spirit, as the life-giving

Digitized by Google

energy of God.[1] The work assigned to Christ was to destroy the particulars of the devil in man. He accomplished that work perfectly in His own person; and His aim now is to *apply* the process to us, so that we become dead unto sin and alive unto righteousness. Jesus Christ having the Spirit "without measure," was able to achieve the great result with absolute entirety in His own person, so that He laid "that foundation other than which none can be laid,"—the foundation of a new and perfect manhood; and by the vouchsafement of His own precious blood, that is His own spirit of grace unto the Church, and through the Church unto us, we have the pure life-blood of His spiritual being given to us, as the life of God in our own souls. This constitutes our "effectual calling"; and out of effectual calling we have "justification, adoption, and sanctification, and the several benefits which accompany or flow from these"; that is, we have the regeneration which is welcomed by Heaven.

[1] See Chapter VIII., on the blood of Christ, whereby we have the remission of sins: See also Excursus XXII.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XXII.

ON EATING THE FLESH AND DRINKING THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

THERE has been much controversy on this head: how is it to be settled? Christ uses these very remarkable words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you: Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 53). There is no allusion in this passage to the Lord's Supper: there can be none; for the Lord's Supper had not then been instituted: it had not once been spoken of: it had not been as yet even thought of. The words refer without doubt to the application of Christ to us,—to the bestowment of Christ on us,—to the receiving of Christ by us,—to our acquisition of Christ. Christ had just said: "I am the bread of life," *i.e.*, the bread that giveth life; and again, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh which I will give for the life of the world." The great object expressed by our Lord in this passage is the impartation of Himself as life.

What is the life spoken of in the passage? Unquestionably it is life spiritual. Christ came to give to man

Digitized by Google

that life. Man had forfeited that life: and man as fallen had grown to ignore that life. It is one of the most difficult things to realise spiritual life. The Jews could not directly do so. They were able to look directly only on *carnal* things: hence God gave to them a dispensation of carnal things: Yes! that through these He might impart to them some knowledge or at least some idea of spiritual things. Carnal things are visible: spiritual things are invisible. Hence even now we have difficulty in realising spiritual things. Yet the dispensation which Christ came to introduce was and is a dispensation directly of spiritual things. This is emphatically the dispensation of the Spirit. The dispensation which was given by Moses was essentially a dispensation of *visible* things. In that dispensation, sin was set forth as a visible thing, and righteousness as a visible thing, and peace as a visible thing, and life itself as in some sense a visible thing. And hence the tendency of that people to idolatry, the idolatry of visible things:—they had a desire to worship some visible thing. In order to constitute visible representations a bullock was introduced: the sinner laid his hands upon it and he thereby infected it with his sin, and he said, "There is my sin"; and then he slew it, and he said, "There goes my sin". Again, a bullock could be made his *devotion* to God: it was offered on the altar of burnt offering which contained the sacred fire; and when it was burnt and went off in the flames, he said, "Thus do I go up to God," as an object solemnly dedicated to Him. Again, a bullock might be made the visible object of his peace, or his thanksgiving, and when he offered this in like manner, he said, "There is my gratitude to God," or "There is my reconciliation with God".

Digitized by Google

We cannot wonder, then, that with these people life also should be regarded as something visible. Man has naturally no conception of life apart from what is visible. To realise the idea of God as the living God, it behoved God to make Himself visible to the Jews. They could not apprehend the idea of spirit. If Abraham should plead with the Lord, it behoved the Lord to take on a visible form as in the plains of Mamre. If Jacob should see God, it must be in the form of an angel. If Moses, it must be in the flaming bush: if Israel, there must be the marvellous cloud. So man has had difficulty in contemplating the life of man as otherwise than in a living body of material flesh and blood. And consequently when the life of man has been spoken of, he was thought of as a living body,—as he is upon the earth, *i.e.*, as man has had the experience in himself and in others. Man had known himself only in a visible body of flesh and blood. He had seen and known his fellow-man only in a visible body of flesh and blood. When therefore the life of man was thought of and spoken of, people at once recalled the ideas which were familiar to them, *viz.*, the life of which they had alone the consciousness in the material body of flesh and blood.

Even to this day it is most difficult to get quit of the idea of visible things, though upon reflection we must rest satisfied that invisible things must be spoken of. For example, Christ at the Holy Supper with His disciples, said of the bread, "This is My body," and of the wine, "This is My blood," and this in perfect conformity with the teaching He had formerly given forth: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life, and I

Digitized by Google

will raise him up at the last day." There was perhaps some excuse for the Jews, who had been accustomed to a dispensation of visible things, to cry out: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" No doubt even they ought to have known better, because they were taught invisible things by means of visible; but there is no excuse for the Romanists, who teach that the bread and wine are really converted into the actual flesh and blood of Christ. They err in two ways, first in that they go for life to purely material things which cannot profit them; for no one has been able as yet to understand how material flesh and material blood could give life, life to the soul, the life that is spoken of for eternity: and second, in that they utterly forget that the present is a dispensation of spiritual things in contrast with a dispensation of carnal things. Even we who are Protestants are so carnally minded that we have difficulty in "discerning the Lord's body" as we ought. When Christ said, "This is My body," and again, "This is My blood," we are apt to look upon Christ as He was seen upon the earth, as He was seen with the outward eyes, as He was seen to be a man among men. Let me tell you that the earthly body, which Christ took, was *not* intrinsically *His own* body, and the blood of that body was not intrinsically *His own* blood. True it is that He appropriated that body and blood, and in so doing He made the same in a sense His own; but that body and blood were not essentially or constitutionally *His*, but emphatically *ours*, and hence we are spoken of as being "in Him"; and His object in appearing invested with our covering was to discharge and take away all the characteristics of that body and blood as *ours*, and to display that body with its own

Digitized by Google

proper life-blood which was essentially and truly "His own". When Christ, therefore, said, "This is *My* body," and again, "This is *My* blood," we are not for a moment to have respect to that body and blood which is human, which is ours, which He had from His mother, and which He sacrificed by that mighty working whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself; but we are to have respect to that body and blood which He has re-created for Himself out of the ruins of the former, and which fundamentally and essentially is *His own*,—*His*, not ours; yet *His* to be given to *us*.

Can we acquire any real understanding as to what Christ's body and blood really are? We can tell at any rate what it is not. First of all it is *not mortal*. The body of ours which Christ took was *mortal*: the body which was redeemed by Him, was and is essentially immortal. Think of that. This immortal body, then, He bestows on us. Here we live in constant fear; the fear of death is our bondage. We look forward and see that enemy in the foreground, and there is no escape from his unrelenting hand. But Christ says to us: Fear not, I give to you a body that shall live for ever, and there shall be no more death.

Again: the body of Christ is not dependent on the supplies of this world for its life. *Our* bodies are so. We require therefore to eat and to drink for the sake of our earthly life. And this too is matter of anxiety to many. We require clothing to warm our bodies: we require a house to shelter our bodies: we require victuals to nourish our bodies. But Christ's body requires nothing of the earth earthy—no earthly clothing—no earthly asylum to lodge in—no bread of this world for its support. This wonderful body, then, Christ

Digitized by Google

vouchsafes to us; and when we shall have put it on, then shall we be independent of the earth, and all that it contains. Then shall the rich man be no longer an object of envy to the poor man, for rich and poor shall then be together upon a wholly different platform from the present.

Again: the body of Christ is not dependent on the ordinary instrumentality of locomotion. When Christ was upon the earth, many a weary step He trode, in order to fulfil His message as a man among men. The mountains of Palestine found Him often footsore and exhausted as He threaded His way to the various objects of His beneficence; and the reason was that He had to employ our body; and He had therefore a fellow-feeling of our infirmities; but when Christ put on His own body, or rather redeemed the body which was *ours*, and made that body absolutely *His own*, He was not thus restricted. His body had a power of movement unlike to ours, a movement peculiarly its own. His means of transit was not necessarily the slow and tedious method which belongs to us of putting one foot on the ground, and then another in alternate step, and by this method in the course of time reaching some distant abode. The body which Christ achieved had other means of locomotion, and that unseen by mortal eye. It had the wondrous prerogative of being visible at one moment and of being invisible at another. And when visible, of fulfilling the functions and presenting the characteristics, of our ordinary bodies; but when invisible, it was independent of the obstructions by which we are beset, in that doors and walls formed no barrier to its progress, for we are expressly told that He came into the room where the disciples were assembled, "the doors being

Digitized by Google

shut"; and again, when He had accompanied the disciples into the village of Emmaus and had sat down with them in their lodgment, He "vanished out of their sight". The body of Christ then, as essentially belonging to Himself, was a spirit-body; and therefore when we speak of Christ's body and blood, we speak of things essentially spiritual.

And shall *we* partake of Christ's body and blood? Yes! Such is the gracious promise. The Lord "shall change this our vile body (the body of our humiliation), that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body (the body of His glory) according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself". Then we shall be able to dive into depths and to climb unto heights which far surpass all that man can presently accomplish. Man in the present day can do wonderful things through the privileges of science; then, however, we shall be able in our own persons to achieve results beyond all our present experience; for we shall be made equal to the angels; and the life and powers and attributes of holy angels shall be ours.

And *how*, it may be asked, do we obtain the body and blood of the Lord Jesus? The answer is, that the acquisition begins with our souls, and the formation thereof takes place even now. If we were better acquainted than we are with the mechanism of our souls,—with the secret powers of what we may call the divine substance: if we were better acquainted with the connection betwixt soul and body, we should see that every soul contains the crust or sheathing which is the medium betwixt matter and thought; and therefore that with the impress of Christ there goes on now that formation of soul which shall be developed with its spirit-body at

Digitized by Google

the resurrection. In plain terms let me tell you, that the soul, as formed under the discipline of Christ, becomes the seed of that body which shall be evolved when we shall be raised from the grave of Hades.

It is the soul, therefore, that now acquires the spirit-body and the blood of Christ: it is the soul that is now formed in accordance with the image of Christ; and what then? Why, when the material mortal husk or shell, with which our souls are presently invested, shall be cast off, we shall not be found naked, but we shall be ensheathed in that spiritual tegument, which in point of fact forms the very groundwork of our souls, which forms the necessary medium of linking matter with mind; and it will be eternal when conditioned with Christ. Here then we have the doctrine established, that whatsoever we sow that we shall reap. We see this in the world of our experience. If we sow grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain, we shall reap accordingly. It is so in respect of that wonderful manifestation which shall be made at the resurrection. Whatever may happen to be the state of your souls when you die, after the acquisition of divine things which you have made under the discipline of Christ, with these same characteristics will you be raised, when Christ shall appear to dispose of the world.

What awful considerations does all this involve! There is a resurrection to life, and there is a resurrection to condemnation. We have life given to us now, when we partake of the body and blood of Christ. And when I say this, I beseech you to think of the body and blood of Christ—not that body and blood of Christ which He had upon the earth, and which was intrinsically *ours;* but His own body and blood as now in

Digitized by Google

glory. He took what was ours, that casting off what was ours, we might become partakers of what is His, and we partake of what is emphatically His, when by faith we have the communion of His body and blood, as our Catechism says, "not after a corporal or carnal manner," but after a spiritual manner, even to our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.

Paul's concern with his converts was that Christ might he formed within them. "My little children (he writes to the Galatians) of whom I travail in birth again *until Christ be formed in you.*" The Church is, as it were, the bowels of Jesus Christ, and in accordance with this sentiment he says to the Philippians: "I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ". And again he says to the Corinthians: "In Christ Jesus (*i.e.*, in the bowels of Christ Jesus) I have begotten you through the gospel". The gospel, then, is the seed of Christ, it is the body and blood of Christ. Get this and you will be "conformed to the image of God's dear Son": get this and you will "put on the Lord Jesus Christ": get this and you will "put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness": get this and you will have "Christ in you the hope of glory". See what it is then to eat the flesh of the Son of Man and to drink His blood. For this, faith is needed.

"Without faith it is impossible to please God," *i.e.*, to exercise the life which is vouchsafed by Christ, which is acceptable to God, and which is obtained by faith. Faith is the channel of spiritual life; and the spiritual material which flows through that channel is the blood of Christ. In other words, faith in Christ is the receiving of Christ. Then it follows, that the eating

Digitized by Google

of Christ's flesh, and the drinking of Christ's blood, must of necessity mean that partaking of Christ which confers spiritual life on our souls, even that new life which Christ came to bestow.

That new life, I have said, is now only in process; and a partaking of it implies that ultimate possession which constitutes the glorification of the creature. Christ Himself came to be exalted as man to the possession of this life. He never wanted spiritual life; but He had a process to undergo in order to the attainment of *His own* proper human sphere. Having become obedient to death, even the death of the cross, it is said, "Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name". In short, it behoved Christ to be "put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the spirit". It was only in these circumstances that Christ performed the work given Him to do. The flesh had to be sacrificed, as a power that lay in the way,—as an obstruction to heaven. The sacrifice was made; the veil of the flesh was torn; the way therefore to glorification was opened up; that life, which was the great object of Christ for immediate obtainment, was realised,—that life, on the realisation of which depended all the future conquests which Christ looked forward to achieve. Hence it is said, "for the joy that was set before Him, He endured the Cross, despising the shame". He attained the goal of a perfected humanity. That goal is set before us; the life of heaven is set before us; the position which Christ has attained is set before us, as the grand aim of our noblest ambition; and the question now is: How is it to be obtained by us? We must become "partakers of Christ"; we must be "baptised with the baptism of

Digitized by Google

Christ"; we must "put on Christ"; in so doing we must "eat His flesh and drink His blood"; we must share in His experiences; we must take up the cross and die; we must through this shew the new life; we must be crucified to the lusts of the flesh; and, therefore, we must pour out the life of the flesh and partake of the life of the spirit; we must become no longer carnally minded, but spiritually minded; thus shall we share with Christ in His exalted life. If we share with Him in the sacrificial obedience, which is an essential to the possession of that life, then we shall be heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ of the glory that is revealed to us.

Such I take to be the meaning of the passage of Scripture quoted from the 6th chapter of St. John's gospel. If we do not go through the experiences which Christ had, in order to overcome the enemy, we shall fail to realise the end which Christ realised in His struggle with the enemy. Without the cross we cannot have the crown; hence the warfare. "To him that overcometh (saith Christ) I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father on His throne." The analogous character of the fight we have to maintain is clearly made known to us. "As Christ was, so are we in the world"; and as Christ fought, so we must fight the good fight of faith; and as Christ laid hold of and obtained eternal life for the humanity He bore, so must we lay hold of that life which, from Him, is placed within our reach, and keep it as our greatest prize. In this way then—as it can be achieved only by rending the veil of the flesh, as being the obstruction, which prevents an entrance into the Holy of Holies, as it is by thus

Digitized by Google

breaking down the middle wall of partition which lies between us and God—we must follow in the wake of Christ, we must taste of the bitterness which He tasted, we must share the sorrows which He endured, we must bear the pains which He bore; we can be healed only by His stripes. "If we suffer with Him we shall also be glorified together with Him." Thus, then, do we "eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood"; and through this experience it is that we attain to life—life spiritual as the precursor of life eternal.

But on this great subject it behoves us to note that Christ instituted a special ceremonial at the close of His career, which was intended to picture forth this partaking of the essentials of His being. That is, as the celebration of the Lord's Supper belongs exclusively to the disciples of Christ, so this symbol would be serviceable, in the *first* place, in teaching us the great truth that we must be partakers of Christ; and in the *second* place, in teaching us the process of our participation, by intimating to us that the beginning of this process must be by slaying the body of sin, as Christ did when His body was broken; and in the *third* place, by partaking (as by eating we partake of the nourishment which gives life) of the spirit-body and blood of Christ which remains after the carnal body is destroyed, we have life symbolically confirmed to us; and thus the Lord's Supper is a figurative emblem of the Christian dispensation. The principles of the Christian dispensation, we have seen, are implied in the words, eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking His blood; they imply conformity to the death of Christ that we may be sharers of the life of Christ. This

Digitized by Google

conformity is beautifully symbolised by the institution in question.

There can be no doubt that the material things employed therein are to be interpreted spiritually. If otherwise, we cannot wonder at the exclamation of Christ's followers, when with amazement, if not also with disgust, they asked the question, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" It seemed a monstrous idea to them; so much so, that they "walked no more with him"; and, taking in the view which was apprehended by these *quondam* disciples, the idea is no less monstrous now. But these men thought in ignorance, spoke in ignorance, and acted in ignorance. Christ, in the depth of His own spiritual vision, never meant the expression to be regarded in a carnal sense; He had come to establish a spiritual dispensation, a dispensation of faith, a dispensation that imparted spiritual things; and in this symbol, spiritual things through material things—spiritual things which faith alone could apprehend; and when He found their thoughts engrossed by the letter, and that they were not able to look through the letter to the spirit of His instructions, He explains who and what is the Son of Man that had to be offered to them as their meat and as their drink.

The time had not as yet absolutely arrived when they could quite apprehend the nature of that work which the Son of Man had to accomplish, and which He had now all but accomplished; but that time was now nearly reaching its consummation: then would the Son of Man be offered to them in His own essential and glorified integrity; that is, when He had ascended where He was before; that is, He would be offered in that body and blood which were essentially and in-

Digitized by Google

trinsically *His own*—yes! *His own precious body and blood spiritual*, as distinguished from the body and blood terrestrial which He took as *ours*, and which He sacrificed in respect of its dogmata or demands through life, and finally and absolutely destroyed upon the tree, in order to its ultimate and entire removal by death, as a power pertaining to the manhood. Christ would communicate to them Himself as the risen, living, glorified, and immortalised humanity—a humanity no longer known after the flesh of sin—a humanity from which the flesh of sin as an agent and influence in human experience had come to be discarded; for flesh and blood, as man now has it upon the earth, cannot enter into heaven; a humanity, therefore, involving a body and blood, *i.e.*, a spirit-subsistence and spirit-life adapted to the glorious abode of the Celestial State. The change effected on His followers by the *application* of this regenerated humanity to them, would constitute the introduction of the new life to their souls.

All this, as the vouchsafement of the perfected Christ, would quite correspond with the explanation of the Lord's meaning, when He saw that He was so greatly misunderstood. Our Lord had no respect to the natural flesh and blood of that manhood which He took from a woman, when made man upon the earth, and which so far made Him one of ourselves; for that view is a perversion of His meaning, which only Romanists insist upon. *First* of all, the body of our flesh and blood which He had from His mother required to be "sanctified"; and how could that which it behoved Him to sacrifice give us life? *Second*, there is no such thing in nature as that of a man eating the flesh and blood of man, save among cannibals, who are lifted but

Digitized by Google

a small stage above the brute creation,—a resource abhorrent to intelligent and civilised life. *Third*, there could be no possible virtue, and no possible benefit discernible from partaking of the material elements; *i.e.*, from eating human flesh and blood, supposing the possibility of the transubstantiation. *Fourth*, it would not only be carrying back the mind to the dispensation of material things, which Christ's followers were now called to abandon, but it would go to degrade the mind by an enactment which the Old Testament instruction never contemplated. *Fifth*, the dispensation of the New Testament was pre-eminently a dispensation of faith, a dispensation of the Spirit, revealing spiritual things for our reception by faith; and this ought to have been readily understood when our Lord said, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing". But, as has been observed, the passage referred to does not in the circumstances touch upon the institution of the Lord's Supper, but bore only on that impartation of Himself to the believer, which is the great end and aim of the Christian economy. And I need not repeat that in receiving Christ, as He is freely offered in the Gospel, we are then prepared to celebrate that holy sacrament which symbolises our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XXIII.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF SUBSTITUTION.

If substitution were the proper word for Christ's attitude to man in making atonement for sin, why has it not been so much as once employed by the standards of the Church? And if it is said that "His obedience and satisfaction were accepted in their stead," why is it added that "they are not justified until the Holy Spirit doth in due time *apply* Christ to them"? Is it not hence obvious that while the "foundation" was laid in the sacrifice made by Christ, and while Christ thus became equipped to be the Saviour of men, the Holy Spirit has been made the agent in discharging the debts of all who are justified; and that hereby a proper, real, and full satisfaction is made to the Father's justice? Yes! in as far as the Holy Spirit is said to *receive* or *take* of the things of Jesus, to shew or reveal them to us; and we are said to be justified, when, and only when, we *receive* them. There can be no doubt, then, that Christ is the author or prime cause of our salvation; yet this not by substitution, but by the ministration of the grace that is in Him, the grace that is vouchsafed from Him, the grace that is contained in the gospel, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation". "By grace are ye saved through faith,"—not

Digitized by Google

as a dry act of simple *favour*, for that is not the full meaning of grace; grace is not empty favour. When God bestoweth grace, He bestoweth the healing medicine, by which our ailment is removed, He bestows the ransom-money by which we are redeemed; by grace are we saved—saved through a faith that receives the grace. That grace we have not in or by ourselves; it is the gift of God. "We are saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This grace is the redemption-price; and the redemption-price is the gift of God. Can anything more clearly indicate that the application, and not the substitution of Christ, is the principle of salvation.

Hence Paul, speaking of his acceptance with God, says, "I, yet not I, but Christ dwelling in me". We forget that the obedience which we render as Christians, is not our own natural obedience, but that of Christ dwelling in us. It is obvious, then, that the modes of expression in the Confession of Faith must be taken in that sense which is at once in conformity with its own deepest significance in the interpretation of faith, and in harmony with the best interpretation of the sacred revealments of Scripture. In which case we are astricted to hold that we are justified, *not by substitution*, but by *receiving* the righteousness which cometh from Christ, and which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures. This simple fact supersedes the idea of substitution, as in point of fact of no value, in as far as it is the *application* of Christ to us which is declared to be of essential value.

Is it to be said that the application of Christ to us is impossible unless there be first the substitution of Christ for us? I answer, of course, there could be no application of Christ unless there were first the provision of

Digitized by Google

Christ: had there been no equipment of Christ as a Saviour, there could have been, and could not be, any application of Christ as a Saviour. But the equipment, or qualification of Christ to become the Saviour, is a very different thing from the substitution of Christ in our room and stead. The theories, which have hedged themselves around this latter notion, have plunged the churches into dilemmas from which they have never been able to extricate themselves. *First*, there is the incongruity of ascribing to Christ a make-believe; *i.e.*, of imparting to Him sin, which, the believer in said imputation feels sure, did not in any way belong to Him. *Second*, there is the incongruity of inflicting a real penalty or actual punishment for a fancied or unreal sin. *Third*, there is incongruity in our ascribing an atonement as made by proxy, that is, by employing a deputy to do our religion for us. *Fourth*, there is incongruity in saying that an atonement is made for sinners, before the sinners or their sins have had any existence. *Fifth*, there is an incongruity in ascribing a selection of certain for the benefit of atonement, where, in the circumstances, selection seems impossible; seeing one and all were necessarily regarded as similarly under the self-same condemnation. *Sixth*, there is the incongruity of calling on men to repent, if beforehand they are reprobated; seeing some only are elected to become heirs of the grace of life. *Seventh*, there is an incongruity in contracting the efficacy of the work of Christ, *i.e.*, limiting the extent of the applicatory character of His death, seeing it is said so emphatically that "Christ died for all," that is, died that all might have the possibility of his atoning work applied to them, under the general call of God, when He summons *all* to repentance.

Digitized by Google

If such a principle as substitution can be admitted, why do we find fault with the Roman Catholics, who enjoin sacrifices to take friends out of purgatory? Why do we find fault with their doctrine of payments to secure immunity from the penalty of sin? This doctrine of religion by deputy attaches itself to us as well as to Romanists. Once admit that Christ is a substitute for us, and we are "at ease in Zion"; and like the parasite who, instead of exerting its energies in order to acquire the food which is ordinarily provided for it, lazily adheres as a hanger-on, or as a mere time-server on the life of another, of which it is not normally a partaker.

And here, if anywhere, is the greatest of all dangers attending parasitism, in that the *mere professional* believer thinks that by mere assent to Christ, instead of positive partaking of Christ, he can obtain the life as it is in Christ. Sinners can never be justified by an abstract operation which does not change them, which does not touch them, which does not reach them. As well might we expect a withered tree to be regarded as flourishing because a neighbouring tree is in all the fulness of a living existence. And another incongruity still, is the folly of supposing that God can regard any as righteous who are actually sinners. "Are not God's eyes upon the truth?" and must He not pronounce according to truth?

It has been said that the doctrine of substitution is taught in the Old Testament under the Mosaic economy, in that victims were substituted and slain in the room and in the stead of the offerer, who deserved to die. But this idea is founded in an egregious mistake. Victims were *never substituted* by the appointment of God as an atonement for the sin of the offerer. How

Digitized by Google

could they, seeing *their* blood could not take away human sin? The victims were appointed to *teach the lesson of atonement*, not themselves to become the substitutionary atonements for sin. It was never hinted that the offerer, when he laid his hands on the victim, thereby got quit of his own sin; God never prescribed such a notion as that; as well might we believe that, when a leper touched another man, and by contagion communicated his leprosy to him, the leper was thereby himself cleansed. No such analogy is found in the whole economy of God.[1] There was nothing therefore in the formal process of preparing the victim for slaughter that could lead the offerer to suppose that his sin was by that process removed. It was his own perverse desire for an easy mode of becoming quits with God that led to his regarding the victim as a substitute. And it is the same earnest desire that would now point to these victims in Old Testament times as substitutes for the offender. What God meant, and sought to be impressed on the understanding and on the heart of man, was *the necessity of sin being sacrificed.* In the victim the offerer was indeed commanded to see his sin, that is a representation of his sin; and it was called "his sin" (see Lev. iv.) that he might see how it had to be treated. How was that sin to be dealt with? God told him *it must be put to death.* Thereby was God's hatred against sin manifested, and manifested by such an illustration, far more emphatically than any mere words could convey. It was but an easy transition therefore to apply a similar meaning to that very sin, as lurking in his own bosom. The Psalmist got

[1] The doctrines of substitution is expressly disowned in 2 Kings xiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxv. 4; Jer. xxxi. 30; Ezek. xviii. 20.

Digitized by Google

hold of the Divine idea when he said, "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart God would not despise". That this mode of getting quit of sin was pleasing to God, David experienced, when, smarting under the guilt whereby he had slain Uriah and taken his wife, he exclaimed in a gush of deep sorrow and contrition, "I have sinned against the Lord". Forgiveness was then declared by the prophet.

The utter folly of mere dry sacrifices as substitutes, was sufficiently intimated to Israel, when God said: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? Bring no more vain oblations. *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings* from before mine eyes; *cease to do evil; learn to do well.*" And again another prophet says, "Though ye offer unto Me your burnt offerings, and meat offerings, I will not accept them". What was the reason? Their persistency in sin. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Israel had no right certainly to look upon these external emblems as substitutes for sin: as atonement-makeshifts for their transgression.

And still less right have we to regard a sacrifice, that lies altogether outside of ourselves, a substitute for our sin. Without doubt the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus was an atonement; and the grandest feature of atonement ever displayed in the world — an atonement which teaches the world an emphatic lesson beyond, far beyond, the lessons which God was pleased to prescribe in the Old Testament, but it was *not as a substitute* for the offender. If a substitute, how could

Digitized by Google

Paul say: "I am crucified with Christ," that is, I am crucified as Christ was. If a substitute, how could Christ himself so emphatically demand that we must "take up the cross and follow Him"? If a substitute, how could Paul enjoin saying: "I beseech you by the mercies of God *present your bodies a living sacrifice*, holy and acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service"? If there be one thing more than another that is demanded under the Christian economy, it is this, that we must be "built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to *offer up spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God by Jesus". Will the alleged substitution of Christ as a sacrifice suffice in the stead of this requirement? If not, the sooner we become disabused from the idea of substitution the better for our souls; the sooner the Church comes to see the utter baselessness of such a prop the better for the Church.

Is it asked, then, for what end was Christ in our midst; and put to death as a sacrifice for sin? The answer is that, in the first place, He is the fundamental and the central object wherein we see atonement carried out in absolute perfectness; and in the second place, He is the source of that grace whereby alone we can have that same atonement applied to ourselves. Hence the necessity of faith in Him. "Behold I lay in Sion (saith God) a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: unto you which believe, He is precious; but unto them which be disobedient, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence." Is there anything like substitution here encouraged, seeing faith is so much insisted on, in order that we may be made one with Him? Certainly substitution (if it existed) helps not at all without faith in Jesus Christ; and if there be faith in Christ, all that is

Digitized by Google

wanted is obtained, *viz.*, "*the grace of God that bringeth salvation*".

It may be conceded that the doctrine of substitution is one into which some churches have not unnaturally fallen; and this on two grounds: first, from a misunderstanding of the nature of the incarnation,—a misunderstanding which fails to "discern the Lord's body," and the relation in which the body of man stands to the soul; and second, from a misapprehension of what is termed "the finished work of Christ". The misunderstanding in regard to the former point is the cause of misunderstanding in regard to the latter point. For want of knowledge as to the Lord's body, we fail to see what was the sacrifice which the Lord had to render, and consequently we fail to see what was the sacrifice which the Lord did render; consequently we mistake as to "the finished work of Christ". There can be no greater mistake than to interpret that finished work as effected by substitution for us His disciples, before we were born. For what happens? Why, when we come into the world we find that a great work has to be done in us—a work which Christ rose from the dead to accomplish, a work which He now performs through the appointed discipline of the Church. When Christ said "It is finished," there cannot be a doubt that He referred to Himself, as having now drunk the last bitter cup which was served out to Him; and that, having drunk this, He was perfected, and so "became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him". If all this were apprehended and understood, the dogma of substitution could no longer be retained.

Will it still be persisted in, that Christ on Calvary suffered, in our room and stead, the punishment due to

Digitized by Google

us for our sins, and therefore that the punishment which we should each of us have borne was there inflicted upon Him, and that the price exigible for our redemption was then paid by Him as He hung upon the cross? There is surely inconsistency here in more respects than one. There is inconsistency, *first*, in making the atonement to consist in a mere matter of stripes, as if it were any satisfaction to God simply to inflict pain; there is inconsistency, *second*, in making atonement to consist in a matter of stripes by proxy, as if the infliction of pain by way of punishment on another, instead of on the party to whom the punishment is due, could be any satisfaction to God; there is inconsistency, *third*, in inflicting pain in circumstances, where believers in substitution hold there was absolutely no demand for it—in circumstances where they maintain there was nothing whatever to be remedied or restored. I need not here take up the point as to the position which the Lord Jesus assumed when he condescended to become incarnated by our flesh and blood. That is done in the next Excursus. While Himself absolutely sinless, He had yet without doubt to shake off that load of sin, which was thereby laid on Him. As to pain, I have again and again shewn that atonement could not possibly be made without pain, because sin can never be removed without pain; but pain is not the final end which God seeks; it would be unworthy of God if it were. The final end which God seeks is the removal of the offence, *viz.*, sin, as a power over the soul; and if pain is inevitable in connection with this process, pain is to be regarded as the price, without which the removal of sin is impossible.

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XXIV.

ON CHRIST MADE SIN.

CHRIST "made sin," and Christ "without sin"! Can both be literally and simultaneously true? There is, of course, one kind of assertion which no one can receive, and it is this—that a thing *can be* and *cannot be*, in the same sense. and at the same time; otherwise there would be no distinction betwixt affirmation and denial —no distinction between existence and non-existence— no distinction betwixt truth and falsehood! Whatever *is*, *is* for the time being; and whatever *is not*, *is not* for the time being; otherwise intelligence would be a dream, reason would be a delusion, and faith would be a snare, and existence a nonenity. The principle of "non-contradiction," as it is known in the field of philosophy, stands at the foundation of all argumentation; it is the very first principle of logic, and remains a fixity in every affirmation or denial, throughout all the practical details of life, whatever may happen to be the interests or the dispositions of men. None are found who can deny, in the same breath, what they are found to affirm, as touching the self-same point.

What then are we to make of the statement that Christ was "made sin," and the statement simultaneously made that "He knew no sin"? (2 Cor. v. 21).

Digitized by Google

Our revised version of the New Testament renders the passage here referred to—"Him who knew no sin, He (God) made to be sin in our behalf"—and the rendering is correct and faultless; but after all, this does not satisfy the mind of the Church, which, taking into account the many passages which indicate the sinless heart and life of Jesus Christ, will not submit to have sin ascribed to Christ. Hence the refuge to which it has been felt that recourse must of necessity be made as to the peculiar dogma of imputation, a dogma which ascribes to one what in truth he does not possess, and which has been well called a "make-believe," or if not a make-believe, a *putative indictment*, which has no real or substantial foundation, and which, take it as we may, is but an evasion and a pretence. For one thing is certain, that the affirmation and the contradiction cannot, under whatever name, both be true at the same moment, *viz.*, that *sin* is attachable to a certain precise object, and, also, that in the same sense *no sin* is attachable to it. The inquiry then is (1), in what sense *sin* is predicated of Jesus Christ, and (2), again, in what sense *no sin* is predicated of Jesus Christ. That there is a distinction of this sort is obvious enough, and that under the distinction which belongs to Him, as emphatically called "the wonderful," a true and sound interpretation can be attained is, I think, obvious: and the Scriptures themselves supply the key, whereby the difficulty may be opened and dispelled.

As regards the question of sin attachable to Christ, St. Paul uses very emphatic terms. That in Rom. viii. 3 says, "God sent His own Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin He *condemned sin in the flesh*". The translation here (and no doubt from the dread of ascrib-

Digitized by Google

ing sin to the Lord Jesus) has not received its due fulness and freedom. I hold it to be as follows:—that "God sent His own Son in the sameness (or identity) of sinful flesh, and *concerning sin* (περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *i.e.*, as touching the question of sin) He condemned sin in the flesh". Here sin is said to be in the flesh, *i.e.*, to have its root and source in the flesh. How could Christ condemn sin in the flesh, if there was no sin in the flesh? and how can it be said that there was no sin in the flesh of Christ, if He is said to have been sent in the very likeness of the flesh which has sin therein? And how can it be said that Christ was sent thus into the world, if He had not the great element of sin to meet, to condemn, to subvert, to destroy?

Is it argued that the sin which He condemned was not sin in His own flesh but sin in our flesh? This, to say the least, is a very forced and unnatural meaning; and grammatically must be regarded as unwarrantable, both in respect of what precedes, and in respect of what follows in the context, as well as in its immediate connection. Why, in the first place, is it said that Christ was sent "in the likeness of *sinful* flesh" (literally "the flesh of sin," *i.e.*, the flesh which breeds or generates sin)? The flesh in which He was sent can alone be referred to, and being referred to as the flesh which begets sin or prompts to sin, what can be more natural than to say that He condemned sin in the flesh, in the flesh which He had taken to Himself, in the flesh in which He had been sent, in the flesh which had been thus characterised? But stress is laid on the word "*likeness*" as implying *unlikeness*, as if there was merely *a resemblance that had no reality as to sameness.* Such an interpretation not only runs counter to all analogy in

Digitized by Google

the use of the word, but cuts deeper into the principles of the Gospel than its advocates are prepared to admit. In fact, let it once be admitted that the word *likeness* here is to be regarded as a mere resemblance, that indicates simply an outward colouring; and it must in that case be denied that Christ had the human nature at all! This of necessity is the inference to be drawn from parallel passages if we adopt the interpretation here contended for by some, as applicable to this passage. What I have said is that the term rendered "likeness" (ὡμοίωμα) is a strong term for *sameness*, to indicate that Christ really took upon Him what is essentially ours, and that He could not do things by halves. If He took upon Him what is ours, He took the same wholly, as the foundation of a constitution He had to battle with in the world and to perfect. Suppose we were to translate the term "likeness" to mean *non-reality*, what must be said of such a passage as this—"He took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man" (Phil. ii. 7)? We should be constrained, in that case, to say that Christ was made in a semblance which had not *the reality of man*, in short, that Christ was not man, and that He had a resemblance only to man; so that, after all, it was but a pretence that He was man! Such one-sided interpretation is (I cannot but think) a most dangerous intermeddling with the natural and obvious rendering of the Sacred Scripture. Besides, the Apostle interposes the remarkable words "for sin" (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), which unquestionably mean that *so far as regards sin, i.e., with reference to His dealing with sin*, in order to its removal, "He condemned sin in the flesh," *i.e.*, the flesh just spoken of.

Digitized by Google

Let us observe further. Christ, it is said, "condemned sin in the flesh *in order that* the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us". It was not His own flesh, in which He condemned sin, but alien flesh, *i.e.*, our sinful flesh as alien to Him. I ask first, is it a fact that sin is condemned in *our* flesh? and I ask second, for what possible purpose can it be said that Christ was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh; or indeed in flesh of any sort, seeing the flesh in which He thus came, had no sympathy with the flesh condemned, and no connection with it, in the very interest for which it was condemned? The language will not bear analysis on the ordinary interpretation. The two statements cannot in consistency cohere, *viz.*, 1st, that Christ was sent in *sinless* flesh; and 2nd, that He verily condemned sin in *sinful* flesh. The causality in these two circumstances is irreconcileable. If the causality is established in the person of Christ, by the simple fact that He was sent in the same sinful flesh which characterises man; then the effect, as an absolute necessity, must be seen in the same causality, *viz.*, the condemnation of sin in that sinful flesh,—*a condemnation that marked His own intrinsic righteousness.*

But farther, as regards the application to us of this power of condemning sin, another causality comes thereafter to be established after the first had been effected, *viz.*, *the linking on of Himself to us*, by the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God to us, that the same end might be fulfilled in *us*, who are made to walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Now, this latter causality was the purpose on account of which the former was instituted and constituted. The

Digitized by Google

simple meaning of the passage therefore must be, that Christ condemned and destroyed the impulses to sin in that body of our flesh which He assumed; thereby bringing in a new manhood, *that* He might apply the same law of operation to us men, that we too might be "conformed to His death," the death of sin in the flesh, so that we, in like manner, should come to "walk, not after the flesh, but after the spirit"; and so that we also should have the law of righteousness, the law which demands righteousness to be fulfilled in our heart and life.

But the passage now referred to is not the only one in which Christ is said to have taken "the flesh of sin". In Eph. ii. 15, it is said: "But now in Christ Jesus, ye that once were far off (*i.e.*, ye Gentiles) are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished the enmity in His flesh, the law of commandments in their demands, that He might create in Himself two into one new man by making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." What is the "enmity" which Christ slew by means of the cross? Unquestionably it was sin. Where was that sin? and how could He reach it? We are expressly told it was "in His flesh" (literally "in the flesh of Himself," *τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἑαυτοῦ καταργήσας*). Nothing can be grammatically more clear or expressive. This "enmity in His flesh" is termed by apposition "the law of commandments in their decrees" (or edicts or demands)—that is the law under which the cravings of the flesh, without reason assigned, seek at once to have their assertativeness

Digitized by Google

(δόγματα) fulfilled. It is an utter misconception, and obvious mistake, to say that Christ abolished the law of divine requirements. Abolished! no, never! He abolished the law of sinful requirements in His flesh, that He might fulfil the law of divine requirements by His flesh; for He was "put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the spirit". Hence it is said that the object of this process on the person of Christ was: "that He might create *the two* in Himself, *into one new man*, by making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body to God through the cross"; and this He did, by slaying and sacrificing the enmity in the carnal part, that the life of the spiritual part might pervade the whole person, as an entire unity with God. There was the foundation then of the old man in the person of Jesus Christ, and that foundation contained in it an enmity against the righteousness of God, and that enmity, as well as the evil suggestions from the devil and from the world, came before the sinless soul of Christ, as pervaded and upheld by the Spirit of God; and so coming, was a source of irritation and trouble from which Christ must altogether free Himself.

It is noticeable in this remarkable passage that the "both" in the 14th verse, and the "both" in the 16th verse are of different genders; the former being in the neuter gender, and the latter in the masculine gender. In either case the *both* must refer to two things that had been immediately mentioned. In the former case it is said: "But now in Christ Jesus, ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ; for He is our peace who hath made both one" (ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν). What "both" is here referred to? *Not Jews and Gentiles!* as is erroneously interpreted; for

Digitized by Google

they are not in point of fact yet made one; they are at this day as much separated as ever; and again, farther, *not Jews and Gentiles!* for it behoved in that case that the masculine gender should be employed; but the neuter gender is employed. What *two things* then are in Christ made one? They are comprehended in the term "the blood of Christ" as applying to two lives. In the first place, Christ had in Him "*the blood of God*," the life of God, the righteousness of God, the purity of God; and in the second place, Christ had in Him *the blood of man*, the blood of our body, the blood of our flesh, the blood of Mary, the blood which craves for the things of this life, even as being supported and maintained by these. These two *things* were in Jesus Christ, then, in virtue of His incarnation; and they constituted the foundation of that terrible struggle in which it behoved Him to engage. The "blood of God" was the *life of the Spirit* pervading the soul; "the blood of the flesh" was the *life of the body* pervading its worldly being, and craving for its worldly subsistence, and even its worldly indulgence. *Both were in one person*, the person of Christ, as now revealed upon the earth, and it behoved Christ to create a unity out of these two disparate things—that is, out of this disharmony; and it could be done only in one way, *viz.*, by "slaying the enmity," *i.e.*, by "breaking down the middle wall of partition," *i.e.*, by sacrificing the flesh, whereby the soul was separated from God. This middle wall is elsewhere called "the veil of the flesh," which Christ rent asunder. In plain terms this is called "abolishing the enmity in His flesh," *i.e.*, the law of carnal requirements, invariably found in all who have experienced the natural desires of the body of this life.

Digitized by Google

And here we apprehend the meaning of the second "both" in the 16th verse, where it is said that the aim and purpose of Christ is declared to be, that He might reconcile "both," as they were in one body, by means of the Cross; and this by slaying the enmity existing in the flesh. What both? Why, *the old man* having enmity to God, and *the new man* having harmony with God—a process effected only by the destruction of the enmity, that is by the crucifixion of the body, as the source of sin. In this way Christ created two distinct natures that subsisted in Him, into one new man, perfectly acceptable to God; and thereby He made peace within, and peace with God.

It would be easy to corroborate all this by a reference to, and an analysis of, other passages of Scripture, but having gone into these somewhat minutely elsewhere, they need not be repeated here. It has only, therefore, further to be noted that, if Christ was "made under the law," He was made amenable to the law; but how could He be said to be amenable to the law, if the law had no claims upon Him? For the law could not possibly have any claims upon Him, if He was made absolutely free from all possible charges thereby against Him. But how did Jesus Christ stand to the law? Here was Christ assaulted by sin at all points, the same in all respects as ourselves. Now this very fact that He should be assailed by sin at all points the same as ourselves, the law of righteousness could not brook; for that person could not be in absolute accord with the law of righteousness in true freedom, who carried about with him an enmity to that law—an enmity which contended against the law of righteousness? If Christ, then, was to honour and magnify the law of righteous-

Digitized by Google

ness, its behests must be heard, *viz.*, that the enmity in the flesh should be abolished and so all cause of offence be removed.

In his 7th chapter to the Romans, Paul points to two contending principles as applicable to the Jew, *one coming from the law of righteousness,* "derived from Jesus Christ as the husband of the soul"; and *the other coming from the law of the flesh* in as far as "the motions of sins are by this law," and in as far as "with the flesh (He says) I serve the law of sin". If Israel, then, was under these two categories, the one "spiritual" and the other "carnal," but in fallen man, the spiritual as if it were not, yielding to the carnal in as far as the husband to whom Israel was married (the Mosaic economy) was unable to check the operation of the law of sin which is in the members: so Jesus Christ came down into the human category, but with this distinction, that in contrast to Israel, the carnal should be sacrificed to the spiritual. He thus became a Husband to Israel instead of the Mosaic law. The husband, as the head of the wife, has the prerogative of assigning rule to the wife, as the law of her obedience; and the Mosaic law had a spiritual meaning, which it would have been well for Israel to follow, and which in the circumstances it was incumbent on Israel to follow; but Israel, as subjected to the commanding law of the flesh, did not follow the Mosaic law after a spiritual sense, the sense and meaning intended; but followed it merely in its outward or carnal sense, as being himself subject to the rule of a carnal law, that is, the mere law of the flesh, good in itself for the purposes of animal nature; but evil essentially as the governing power of a soul, that was intended to be made spiritual, and preparing

Digitized by Google

for a spiritual destiny. Hence the Mosaic husband was taken out of the way; and this, because as such, the law thereof had proved weak and very ineffectual; and another husband was therefore put in the place of the Mosaic husband,—another husband who would shew them more emphatically and more precisely, the exact law of life which God had ordained. They were therefore released from the law of the former husband as now become dead; and they were bound over to the law of the new husband, who was still alive; and who would continue to live; and they were therefore to regard themselves as bound over to the law of this new husband for good and all.

But what was the law prescribed by this new husband? It was the law which clearly and emphatically "condemned sin in the flesh," while it prompted righteousness in the spirit. What constituted sin in the flesh? Let it be noted that body and soul were of necessity joined together in the animal economy; and in the mere animal economy and for the life of the mere animal economy, the prevalence of the law of the flesh was just and good; and served a wise and gracious purpose for the best ends in the world: and this law in man, so far as he was born a denizen of this world, and with an animal nature for this world, it was good in its place, and could not be dispensed with; but this (be it observed) only in its own place; for so soon as it became the *dominating* power over man,—man, as intended for immortality—so soon as it issued its dogmata, *i.e.*, its decrees or commandments, as the final law of man's obedience, in that case sin revived in the soul, and man became *pro tanto* dead to the true law, the law of righteousness.

Digitized by Google

There were two laws in man, and both prescribed by God, and the one must needs be subordinate to the other. The sinful state of the children of Israel was, that they had subordinated the law of the Spirit to the law of the flesh; and the husband therefore, under the name of the Mosaic law, was so weak to stem the power of the flesh, that it had to be taken out of the way; here then is another husband who has shewn practically the relation of the law of the flesh to the law of the Spirit; heeding the former so far as it was proper to permit its operation, but only so far; for when the commandment came from that quarter, in circumstances that did not belong to it, it was met with a sovereign negative, till the most absolute dominion on the part of the Spirit showed itself, and the flesh as a power no longer had a say in the conduct of life.

Such is the argument of the Apostle in what has been regarded as the difficult 7th chapter to the Romans. "The law of members," which is the law of the flesh, which is "the law of sin," when it goes out of its own proper province, as a law subordinated to the law of the Spirit, and when it exercises a dominating or commanding power over the soul, must be put down; for they that are thus in the flesh cannot please God, and cannot prepare for the inheritance of God, as appointed for those that are properly in the Spirit, and who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. The law of the Spirit of life was all-powerful in Christ Jesus, Who condemned the law of the flesh to its proper province and place; and now *we*, that are united to Christ by the marriage-law of a fresh covenant, are bound to His way of it; and if we are truly in Him, then, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus will deliver us" from the

Digitized by Google

commanding power of the flesh, which as such is the law of sin and of death.

The argumentation thus instituted by the Apostle sets forth in great clearness (as I think) two things: first, that Christ in His own person "*overcame*" the contrarieties with which He had to battle in this life; and second, that we are grafted into Christ, that we in Him may similarly "*overcome*". We are placed in the same category with Christ. And the overcoming of necessity involves the remission of the evil of the fall; and this remission of necessity involves the element of atonement, as in the first place *the removal* of the offence, *viz.*, that of submitting to the commanding power of the flesh; and in the second place, *the reponement* of the law of the Spirit; and this atonement is in plain language, establishing and honouring the law under which man was originally placed, and so of condemning the course into which man was brought by the fall, and so therefore of confirming the integrity of God in His work of creation and of glorifying His holy name, and hence of satisfying all His desire.

There are not a few other passages in which it is obvious Christ was "made sin," when He was "made flesh"; and which can be fairly expounded only on the pleas I have now stated, that "He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," "being put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the spirit"; but most of those have been more or less already referred to in the dissertations which have been offered on this all-important theme. (John xii. 23, 24; 2 Cor. v. 16; Col. i. 22; Rom. vii. 4; Col. ii. 13-15; Heb. x. 10, 20, 22; i. 3; ix. 13, &c.)

Digitized by Google

EXCURSUS XXV.

ON JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION, AS INVOLVED IN THE REMISSION OF SINS.

How shall we confirm what has been advanced in investigating this all-important doctrine of Remission of sins? We have in our English version of the Scriptures, a great help to all ordinary readers; but not enough when a critical investigation has to be made into intricate meanings—into the bearing and solution of difficult problems. Looking to our English version, I find no fewer that *ten* passages of the New Testament, wherein the word "remission" is used, and one passage where the verb "remit" is used as applicable to sins; and in all these passages rendered "remission" the term ἄφεσις is employed and the verb ἀφιήμι for "remit" in the original, save in one passage alone in which πάρεσις is employed. The distinction betwixt the two terms ἄφεσις and πάρεσις is well expressed by the Latin words *dimissio* and *prætermissio*. The former (ἄφεσις) is *deliverance* from evil: the latter (πάρεσις) is the *passing over* of evil, as applied to sins of ignorance.

The word "forgiveness" is, in our English version, more frequently used than the word "remission," to denote the *cancelling* of sin. The verb "*forgive*" is found forty-nine times in the Old Testament, and forty-

Digitized by Google

eight times in the New Testament. In examining the passages in the Old Testament, I find three different words employed, *viz.*, כָּפַר, נָשָׂא, and סָלַח.

כָּפַר is a word of frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Bible. In our English Bible it is translated seventy-nine times by the word "atone," three times by the word "forgive," and once by the word "pardon". It is also translated in various passages, by the words "pacify," "appease," "purge away," "reconcile". These in fact are all the renderings for the word in our English version, save in one case, where the word "pitch" is employed, as when the ark was *overlaid* or *covered* with a kind of asphalt in order to render it water-tight, and so render it an ark of safety, when floating on the mighty sea of waters caused by the deluge. I ought to mention that the Greek words in the Septuagint version for כָּפַר are *ἀφιέναι, ἱλασκέσθαι, ἐξιλᾶσθαι, ἵλαον γενέσθαι; καθαρίζειν, κάθαρον γενέσθαι, ἐκκαθαρίζειν, περικαθαρίζειν, ἀθωοῦν; ἁγιάζειν, ἀσφαλτοῦν, ἀφαίρειν.* To *cover* transgression, then, meant to *put it out of the way*, so that it was no more seen; hence to *free from impurity*, hence to *expiate*, to *propitiate*.

נָשָׂא is also a word of very frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Scriptures;—about seven hundred times. In the Kal form alone, our Bible gives no fewer than fifty-five different renderings. Its fundamental meaning seems to be to *raise*, to *lift up*, to *bear*, to *take away*, hence as applied to sins to *forgive*. In the Septuagint are found such terms as *αἴρειν* and its compounds *ἐξ-, ἐπ-, ὑπερ-, ἀν-; ἀρετίζειν, σκυλεύειν, φέρειν, λαμβάνειν* (with its compounds), *ὑψοῦν, κομίζειν, ἱλεῶν γενέσθαι*. In connection with sin, the word essentially means *removal*.

Digitized by Google

סָלַח is translated in our Bible, simply to *forgive*, to *pardon*, to *spare*. Its fundamental meaning is to *separate*, to *loosen*, hence to *untie* a sin, so as to have it removed. Hence like נָשָׂא it comes to be rendered *forgive*. Indeed it seems almost synonymous with נָשָׂא in the sense of *taking away* a sin; and as the *taking away of sin* is the removal of the very thing which is offensive to God, so it comes to imply being *propitious*, as indicating *satisfaction* at the removal of what is unpleasant to look upon. It is used only of God, Who had been offended, as in the circumstances *appeased* or *reconciled*.

What, then, are we to make of Old Testament teaching? We find that therein "the remission of sins" simply means *the removal of sins*. And there is this always implied, as the royal prerogative of Divine mercy, that the offence being taken out of the way, there is no more any visitation by God for the offence. God, in that case, is said to be "reconciled" or "appeased". The penalty is therefore forgiven as an act of Divine mercy. And here we are made to perceive the ground on which alone this prerogative of Divine mercy can be vouchsafed in forgiving sins, that is, in setting aside the penalty attached to sin: that ground is ἄφεσις, or the *removal* of the sin.

I come now more directly to the New Testament. I have mentioned the number of passages in our English New Testament in which the word "remission" is found, and also the number of passages in which the word "forgiveness" (or "forgive") is found. It is noticeable that the word "pardon" is not once found in our English New Testament. Of the ten cases in which "remission" is found, ἄφεσις answers to nine of

Digitized by Google

them; and of the six cases in which the noun "forgiveness" occurs, ἄφεσις answers to all of them. The one passage in which ἄφεσις is differently translated (Luke iv. 18) contains the word twice, and there it is rendered by the terms "deliverance" and "liberty":—"to preach *deliverance* to the captives, and to set at *liberty* them that are bruised". Here, however, its radical meaning of *dimissio* is apparent. Fundamentally, therefore, *the sending away of sins*, is the root-idea for *the forgiveness of sins*. Let sin be taken away, and the wages of sin are thereby taken away.

I ought to notice that the verb "forgive" in all the forty-eight passages of the New Testament, save nine, is the rendering of the verb ἀφιέναι. In seven of the nine the verb χαριζέσθαι is found, *e.g.*, "to whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also" (2 Cor. ii. 10). In one passage (Luke vi. 37) the verb ἀπολύειν is twice used:—"forgive and ye shall be forgiven," which the Revisers render "release and ye shall be released," implying a loosening from a bond. There is unquestionably an affinity of meaning in the passages wherein χαριζέσθαι and ἀπολύειν are used, with that attached to ἀφιέναι. Ἀπολύειν is to *free from*, to *set at liberty*; and as applied to sin, would mean *deliverance from its chain*. But it is doubtful if there is any such use of the word in the New Testament. Χαριζέσθαι means radically to *bestow a favour*, and hence to *forgive a debt*. The transition from the one meaning to the other is easy. To bestow a gift *as to a debt*, constitutes the debt, *no longer a debt*; the debt being presented as a free gift, no longer exists as a debt. Hence the application of the word *forgive* in relation to the debt. As to ἀφιέναι (the word commonly employed with respect

Digitized by Google

to sin), there can be no doubt that it simply means *the sending of it away;* but *to discharge sin is to release the sinner;* hence to *forgive* him.

I have been anxious to bring out what appears the intrinsic meaning of Scripture, on this absorbing theme —"the remission of sins"; because we have most unfortunately (as I think) got ourselves cornered in a difficulty, by putting the cart before the horse in solution of the difficulty. If criticism faithful and just is the legitimate and essential channel of getting at the true meaning of language, and if analogy is the fair exponent of the significance of words—if moreover reason is hereby satisfied by the interpretation educed, surely we may not turn a deaf ear to what is thus proclaimed. And if one thing more than another is set forth as touching sin, it is this, that *its presence is displeasing to God, and its removal is satisfactory to God* —that the great aim of God therefore in His dispensations is, *first, the removal of sin,* and therewith, *second,* comes that act of divine beneficence, *the mercy of God, in discharging from the penalty of sin.* Anything more bewildering than the dogma, that God first takes away the penalty of sin, while yet the sin remains rampant in the soul, I cannot conceive. In and under such a dogma as this, there is nothing to hinder a sinner from taking free and full indulgence in his sin, while yet he cherishes the idea that he is secured against the penalty which sin entails; and it is to be feared that many who are practically living in their sins, are speaking to themselves of peace, where peace cannot be. This is an awful consideration.

I have said enough about the blood of Christ as the panacea for the removal of sins. But how can it re-

Digitized by Google

move sins unless it be applied to souls in sin; and how can it be applied to souls in sin, unless the Church has possession of it for this very end? If there is one thing more evident than another, it is this,—that it is not the blood of Christ's body, but "the blood of the everlasting covenant," the life-blood of the Christian dispensation, the blood of God in Christ Jesus, that constitutes the cleansing, purging, purifying, sanctifying remedy for the removal of sin, and the inbringing of righteousness. The ἀπολύτρωσις lies in the ἄφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων; and the ἄφεσις again is obtained διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In plain terms, Redemption lies in the taking away of sins; and the taking away of sins is achieved through the application of the blood of Christ:—not the blood that is *temporal* in the flesh, but that blood which is *eternal*, and whereby we are said to be made *white*. Thus the taking away of sins, whereby we are made white, is but another name for the remission of sins, that is, the removal of sins, and therewith for exemption from the penalty of sins.

I have already looked into the process whereby sins are removed, and righteousness is imparted. There must of course be first an *emptying* process, before there can be a *replenishing* process: the sack that is filled with chaff must first be emptied, before it can be filled with solid grain. There are two "saving graces" for these ends respectively—one for the *negative process of getting rid of what is our own*, called Repentance; and the other for the *positive process of acquiring what is not our own* (in as far as it essentially belongs to Christ), called Faith. There are no other saving graces as exercises of the human mind, but these two; and they are the exercises under which alone the soul becomes re-

Digitized by Google

generated or made a new creature. Both have to be prompted by God, before they can come into exercise on the human soul; the former by the application of what is called "the terrors of the law," as denouncing sin and condemning the sinner; the latter by the application of what is called the winning charms of the gospel, in imparting righteousness, and therewith promising life to the believer. This latter state (a replenishment of the soul with the life of righteousness) is termed Regeneration, and is synonymous with the "Effectual Calling" of the Catechism.

But we are told that "they that are effectually called, do in this life partake of Justification, Adoption and Sanctification, and the several benefits which accompany or flow from these". In justification we are said to have the ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, which is termed "the pardon of our sins"; but it is simply that *removal of our sins*, which includes the removal of the penalty of our sins. But this is simply a *negative* state, and would betoken nothing more than a release from the penalty of our sins. This release, however, prepares the way for the *positive* state, which betokens an acquisition of the righteousness of Christ, and infers the enjoyment of the reward of righteousness. All is made a subjective process, indicative of that change of heart which displays conformity to God.

In justification, then, there are two aspects, one aspect in which *pardon* is denoted by the removal of our sins; and another aspect in which *acceptance* is denoted by the impartation and consequent imputation of Christ's righteousness. These two aspects are embraced in the definition of justification in our Shorter Catechism. Therein justification is said to be "an act of God's free

Digitized by Google

grace, wherein He *pardoneth* all our sins; and *accepteth* us as righteous, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone". It is obvious, however, that this definition (so succinct and comprehensive) involves in its very nature the principle of sanctification; for what is sanctification but a departure from sin, and an acquisition of righteousness, whereby we are renewed in the whole man, after the image of Christ? The two cannot be separated; or rather, justification of necessity implies and involves sanctification. In fact, the one and the other, *i.e.*, both are obtained through one and the same act or exercise of faith. Faith no doubt is a process, under which there may be increase of grace, as we grow in the knowledge of Christ; and hence sanctification is well termed "a work"; but whatever advancement we make in the knowledge and application of the truth as it is in Jesus, God indicates His satisfaction therewith. Hence justification may be termed *the act of God pronouncing acceptance in the case of true believers*, while sanctification may be termed *the work of God operating on the heart through the process of our believing.*

It is, however, obvious that the compilers of the Confession of Faith, although giving beautiful definitions of justification and sanctification, had yet somewhat misty views as to the process of working out the details; and no wonder, for the details had never been worked out at any period of the Reformation-era. The difficulties were inherent in the fact that *they begged the question of two kinds of righteousness*,—one kind of a communicable nature, and another kind of an incommunicable nature; the latter being made the source of our

Digitized by Google

justification, and the former being made the source of our sanctification.[1] This conception, for which there is

[1] That such a view was held by the compilers of the Confession of Faith, seems likely enough, from the fact of the many writers who have endeavoured to expound justification as having a separate foundation from sanctification, each result being ascribed to a righteousness peculiar to itself:—the one, *viz.*, justification, being regarded as effected under the form of a money-payment rendered by Christ on the cross as the ransom-price for man;—a payment rendered and made operative altogether independent of man, according as the Sovereign absolute will of God as thinking proper of his own good pleasure to employ it in behalf of one rather than another; the other, *viz.*, sanctification, having its application to the heart of man, as the infusion of divine grace for the purification of his soul. This view seems sufficiently probable moreover from the statement in the Larger Catechism which says:—"Although sanctification be inseparably joined to justification, yet they differ in that God in justification *imputeth* the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification His Spirit *infuseth* grace, and enableth to the exercise thereof: in the former sin is *pardoned:* in the other it is *subdued*". Here I should like to ask, What is grace? Must it not include the righteousness of Christ? And if it includes the righteousness of Christ, is not the righteousness of Christ infused into the soul? Does not justification take place by the exercise of faith in Jesus Christ? And doth not this conclusion follow, *because our faith receives a righteousness* which makes him who was a sinner, to become righteous? The Spirit is said to "infuse grace". Very good! The Spirit hath received and brought "the things of Jesus" to us (John xvi. 14, 15): and what are these but the righteousness of Christ? The righteousness of Christ is implied in His sacrifice, for this implies the removal of what is offensive: the righteousness of Christ is involved in His holy life: every act of obedience is ascribed to the righteousness of Christ. His example therefore, as well as His precept, is the revealment of the righteousness of Christ. The Catechism says:—In justification "sin is pardoned," in sanctification "it is subdued"; but if the two are inseparable (as is affirmed), then it may well be asked, How can sin be pardoned, if it be not also subdued? And in what circumstances is the righteousness of Christ imputed? Can it be

Digitized by Google

not a vestige of Scripture-authority, so far as I am able to discover, at once introduced a separation as to the very grounds on which justification and sanctification do respectively rest. It changes entirely the features of justification into what has been called a "forensic" feature without giving to it a forensic foundation; and in point of fact it makes the Confession inconsistent with itself. Here it is particularly where the shoe pinches, on this great question. Let us give up the idea of two kinds of righteousness,—an idea which seems a self-contradiction, and the whole question becomes simple and easy,—understandable and rational,—in every way conformable to Scripture-teaching, and in perfect accordance with our judgment as to the character of faith. Justification by faith is neither more nor less than the Divine satisfaction on our *receiving* the righteousness of Christ, whereby we are made righteous. But if the righteousness of Christ which gives or brings with it our justification, is incommunicable, how in the name of common sense can we be said to *receive* it? Faith is a subjective operation of

imputed when it has not been applied? If so, then at once *we separate* justification from sanctification! What then is imputation? It is the reckoning of what essentially belongs to Christ, as ours, when we receive the same in the exercise of faith. And how comes this reckoning to have a substantial validity? Why, surely, by our receiving the righteousness of Christ. What follows, then, but the *declaration* of the fact, when it is a fact? Imputation, then, is not a mere putative abstraction, which has no solid foundation; but it is the expression of God's satisfaction, when He *declares a thing to be what it is, viz.*, the fact that *we have received, and are therefore clothed with*, the righteousness of God as manifested in Jesus Christ, and that said righteousness has practically become our own, when we employ it as the motive-power of our conduct, in which case, therefore, it is rightfully reckoned to us, *i.e.*, imputed to us in the circumstances.

Digitized by Google

the soul, in that it is *an opening of the heart to receive the communications of God;* and if the communications of God are rightly regarded as righteousness, then the cordial reception of the Divine communications, with an implicit reverence for them as coming from God, a firm trust in them as being all that God represents them to be, and a steadfast cleaving to them as the ordinances of Heaven, constitutes our acceptance with God. It is this idea of the righteousness of Christ, regarded as incommunicable, that has permitted the introduction into our Confession of the statement that "those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth, *not by infusing righteousness into them*, but by pardoning their sins, and accepting their persons as righteous, *not for any thing wrought in them* or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone". If this were all that the Confession contained on the great question of justification, assuredly we must conclude that justification is effected independent of faith, and antecedent to faith. But we hold by the better side of the Confession, when it tells us that justification is that "receiving of Christ and His righteousness" which rests upon Christ and His righteousness, when received.

In this way the doctrine of Imputation becomes natural, simple, and perfectly consistent,—in every way reflective of the honour and beneficence and justice of God. An imputation that would ascribe to God the application of that which in itself is incommunicable to us, or which would attribute as ours, that which essentially is not only not ours, but which by the very terms and meaning of the ingredient cannot be made ours, is not, to say the least, creditable to our ideas of divine accuracy, and absolute truthfulness. It is hoped that

Digitized by Google

enough has been said on this great subject, both with respect to the imputation of our sin to Christ, and with respect to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, as to render that which has become so involved in questionable principles, at once clear and logical, and Scriptural,—commending itself to the reason,—as no less in harmony with sound interpretation of the word of God, than in conformity with the honour and glory of His holy and exalted Name.

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CORRIGENDA.

Page	8,	line	13	from the top,	for *on*	read *at.*
„	15,	„	6	„	„ *has*	„ *have.*
„	19,	„	11	from the bottom,	„ *is*	„ *are.*
„	36,	„	12	„	„ *born*	„ *borne.*
„	38,	„	2	„	„ *metal*	„ *mettle.*
„	41,	„	2	„	„ *land*	„ *find.*
„	49,	„	16	„	„ *Herschell*	„ *Herschel.*
„	70,	„	1	„	„ *Buses*	„ *Basis.*

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Princeton University Library
32101 063843658

Digitized by Google

BOUND AT
KSON'S WORKS,

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google